P. VIVANTE: *Homeric Rhythm: a Philosophical Study.* Pp. x + 164. Westport, CT and London: Greenwood Press, 1997. Cased, £39.95. ISBN: 0-313-30363-0.

In his introduction, Vivante asks an important, though seemingly simple, question (p. 2): 'What is verse?'. His approach to answering that question is revealed in the subtitle, and his argument is based upon discussions like the following (p. 139):

> Nature and art conspired in the development of Homeric Greek. There is the force of nature in the rich organic growth of forms, and there is art in every poetic touch. These two aspects cannot be disentangled from each other. The diverging or anomalous case-endings, for instance, are drawn from collateral kindred formations within the language; they are not arbitrarily cut out and fitted to the versification. Hence comes variety within the encompassing unity. Any Homeric verse has its distinctive ring.

From this and many other passages, it becomes apparent that the 'philosophical study' of the subtitle is founded upon neither the traditions of literary criticism nor oral tradition, but rather upon that of literary appreciation.

In Chapter I, V. dismisses Parry's approach to Homer, asserting (p. 4) that Parry's analysis of Homeric verse reveals 'a perfected technique, an end-result massively shown as an established fact. But for what end? For what poetic reason?'. V. substitutes Hermann Fränkel for Parry, focusing upon Fränkel's 'Der Homerische und der Kallimachische Hexameter' as a more useful approach to Homer. After a second chapter in which he defines his terms, V. devotes Chapter III to a discussion of word order, focusing almost exclusively on the contents of the last two feet in a verse (although this is never stated). In Chapter IV, V. studies enjambement with an emphasis on the poetic art he finds in enjambed run-over words, verse-filling names, and subordinate clauses. Chapter V is concerned with the link which V. sees between Homer's 'sense of time and the use of formulas' (p. 84). V. compares Homeric verse with that of Apollonius Rhodius in Chapter VI, studying speech introductions, silence after a speech, word order, general effect, enjambement, and descriptiveness. In Chapter VII, V. draws his conclusions: he believes that 'an individual poetic mind must have been primarily responsible' for the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* (p. 136); that rhythm was crucial for the development of Homeric Greek; and that both literary critics and believers in oral tradition have been misled in their analyses of the Homeric epics because of 'their literal approach'—instead of accepting as facts a poet, plot, pre-existing narrative, hexameter, poetic diction, and heroic world, Homerists ought to 'concentrate above all on the poetic texture' (pp. 139–40).

Despite the book's subtitle, in matters both great and small, V.'s discussions border on the mystical rather than the philosophical. He cites, for example, *Il.* 3.423 *ἡ δ' εἰς ὑψόροφον θάλαμον κίε δῖα γυναικῶν*, then remarks (p. 4):

> We have a simple act of going, but notice how it is expressed. From the initial 'she' to the final noun, Helen's presence spreads through the verse, quickened by the nimble verb near the center. The effect is one of lightness and solemnity at once. The epithets give fullness to the moment by simply touching off what is there. We linger upon steadfast shapes even while the passing act removes them from our view. Transience finds solidity, and solidity is in turn dissolved. We have rest in movement and movement in rest—at once, tranquillity and motion . . . The force of Homer's verse lies in its rhythm—in the way the words take position, in the way each pause hints suspense, and in the way the parts integrate to realize a growing presence. It would be inadequate merely to point out a combination and adaptation of metrical formulas: the verse has an intrinsic unity, and it came on one wave of rhythm.

Although V. rightly insists on the importance of rhythm, and that merely to list formulas is insufficient, his own remarks do not lead us any closer to understanding either the construction of lines like 3.423 nor larger questions about Homeric poetry, topics which he does discuss.

In his final chapter, V. criticizes all previous scholarship on Homer, arguing that it 'has dealt mainly with the task of piecing together ascertained or alleged facts, without seeking an inner poetic reason for their integration' (p. 139). By abandoning the work of unitarians, analysts, theorists of oral composition, and literary critics, V. has attempted to set off on a new path. Because his argument is based on appreciation rather than upon an approach which might replace those of the scholars whose work he (sometimes justly) criticizes, however, it lacks the power to replace them for explicating what V. regards as 'the true Homer' (p. 135).

SUNY Buffalo C. HIGBIE

P. DRÄGER: *Untersuchungen zu den Frauenkatalogen Hesiods.* (Palingenesia 61.) Pp. vii + 171. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1997. Paper, DM 68. ISBN: 3-515-07028-1.

This book argues in its opening chapter against the view held by Martin West that the last section of Hesiod's Theogony and the *Catalogue of Women* are both post-Hesiodic works of the sixth century B.C. In a previous book (*Argo Pasimelousa* [Stuttgart, 1993]), Dräger had already attacked two of the criteria used by West and others:

1. The view that Medeios, son of Jason and Circe in *Th.* 992–1002, must be the eponymous ancestor of the Medes, and that this passage must belong to the second half of the sixth century (West, *Th.* P. 430).
2. The linking of the myth of Cyrene in the *Catalogue* (frr. 215–7 M.-W.) to the foundation of the city of Cyrene from Thera *c.* 630 B.C.

D. now adds the following points:

1. The existence in *Th.* 1011–16 of Latinus as son of Circe and Odysseus, ruling over the Tyrsenians, is not evidence of a late date, as Greek–Etruscan relations are datable to at least the eighth century B.C. (as West himself observed), and the vague geography of this passage actually suggests a date when knowledge of northern Italy and its surroundings was still rudimentary.
2. The apotheosis of Herakles (Th. 950–55, frr. 25.26–33, 229) is essential to the myth of Herakles and could be a pre-Homeric legend, which the poet of the *Iliad* chose to ignore. (West himself discusses Near-Eastern parallels for this theme in his *East Face of Helicon*, 465 and 471, and it is difficult to see how this motif can be separated from other oriental aspects of this figure.)
3. Differences of style and language between *Th.* 1–900 and what follows are not significant enough to act as criteria for authorship.

The points about the Medes, Latinus, and Cyrene were anticipated by R. Janko (*Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns* [Cambridge, 1982], pp. 86, 247–8), and he found no linguistic evidence to put the *Catalogue* later than the *Theogony*. The argument from differences of style was already challenged by G. P. Edwards (*The Language of Hesiod in its Traditional Context* [Oxford, 1971], pp. 198–9).

The rest of D.'s book makes a number of supplementary and related points concerning the *Catalogue*. In particular he believes (*contra* West, *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women*, pp. 69–72), that the myth of Coronis as mother of Asclepius came in this work, and that Apollodorus followed the Hesiodic version, rather than incorporating elements from Pindar's. There is also a useful survey of spondaic endings in the Hesiodic poems, as a criterion for authorship, although it would have been helpful here to have some comparison with Homeric poetry.

D.'s work is not itself stylistically all that user-friendly, nor does he discuss all of West's dating criteria, but his main thesis does seem to me to deserve serious consideration. West himself had to postulate an earlier version of the ending of the *Theogony*, subsequently adapted, and he made the cut between genuine Hesiod and later work at a very awkward point, in the middle of the list of Zeus's marriages. Several of the arguments for sixth-century dating are not very convincing. It

is surely more reasonable to give due weight to the almost universal view of antiquity (cf. West, *Hesiodic Catalogue of Women*, p. 127), and to believe that the end of the *Theogony* and the *Catalogue* were either (for the most part at least) the work of Hesiod himself, or of Hesiod and his immediate followers (if such there were). This would still allow for some later additions, as with the Homeric poems. West himself believes (*Hesiodic Catalogue of Women*, pp. 125ff., especially pp. 164ff.) that most of the genealogies in the *Catalogue* had already been constructed by the end of the eighth century B.C. It is hard to see how Hecataeus *c*. 500 B.C. could have accepted the *Catalogue* as Hesiodic (*FGH* 1 F 19), if its composition was as recent as West argued. Moreover, it is surely more probable that Stesichorus (*PMG* 223) is echoing the *Catalogue* (fr. 176 M.-W.) than that he is following a similar but earlier poem for which we have no evidence (West, op. cit., pp. 133–4).

Martin West's work on Hesiod and the *Catalogue of Women* remains invaluable. But when it comes to dating we must be grateful to D. for re-opening this question.

Merton College, Oxford N. J. RICHARDSON

D. E. GERBER (ed.): *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets*. (*Mnemosyne* Supplement 173.) Pp. viii + 291. Leiden, etc.: E. J. Brill, 1997. Cased, $100. ISBN: 90-04-09944-1.

Perhaps millennium-fever is to blame, but the genre of academic publishing known as the 'companion' is booming. On the face of it, Greek lyric poetry needed a 'companion', a book whose primary aim, as Gerber says in his preface (p. vii), is 'not to break new ground, but to make the reader aware of the main problems and controversies associated with the Greek lyric poets, and to provide the necessary bibliography for further study'. And, as the author of the extremely useful *Lustrum* surveys of Greek lyric poetry, G. seems the ideal person to edit it.

The book is organized in four sections: elegiac, iambic, personal poetry, and public poetry, each of which gets roughly the same number of pages; the division 'personal' versus 'public' replaces the older one between 'monodic' and 'choral' which G. rejects in his preface (pp. 1–2). The territory was assigned to four scholars based in Canada. To Christopher Brown iambos; to G. himself elegy; to Bonnie MacLachlan 'personal poetry' (Alcaeus, Sappho, Ibycus, Anacreon, Corinna); and Emmet Robbins assumes the disproportionately heavy burden of 'public poetry' (Alcman, Stesichorus, Simonides, Pindar, Bacchylides). No attempt is made to extend the chronological range beyond Bacchylides. More general issues are briefly discussed by G. in the preface (see below); in addition, the sections on iambic and elegiac begin with detailed discussion of those genres.

The good news is that much of the book is very useful. I might single our Brown's thorough survey of iambic, which will contribute greatly to making this difficult area accessible to English-speaking students; and the same could be said for MacLachlan's sensible and balanced treatment of personal poetry (particularly useful in the comparatively neglected areas, e.g. Corinna and Ibycus). And G.'s own discussion of elegy is a model of clarity.

But I have two criticisms. The strategy of giving the four major subdivisions a similar space has the consequence that the first two subdivisions are rich in detail (e.g. Brown's leisurely exposition of the iambic genre), while the discussion of public poetry, a much larger area, is by contrast thin. In his treatment of Pindar, for example, Robbins has chosen to forgo a panoramic survey in favour of an in-depth reading of a single poem, *Pythian* 8. But while that strategy works as an introduction to the epinikion, it leaves out the other genres, which is where most of the progress has been made in recent decades: the paeans are treated in a few lines (the statement on p. 254 n. 11 that there are altogether fragments of twenty-two paeans is misleading), the dithyrambs hardly mentioned, and so on. The root of the problem here may perhaps have been an editorial decision to allow Pindar no more space than the other poets.

A second criticism relates to the subjects covered. True to its title, the book proceeds author-by-author (for the most part). But what we really need in a companion are discussions of general subjects within lyric poetry: modes and contexts of performance, genre, voice, comparison with lyric poetry in other ancient cultures, influence on Greek drama, transmission, canonization, reception, and so on (in other words, a companion to lyric poetry rather than lyric poets). Contrast the organization of the recent Brill *New Companion to Homer*. G.'s introduction, which attempts to map out some of the general issues, is too brief and superficial; to single out just one area, the complex problem of 'classification', the bibliography is confined to English

works, including Harvey's important article in *CQ* 1955 and Smyth's admirable but outdated *Greek Melic Poetry*; and the bibliography fails to mention the standard analysis of the testimonia, H. Faber's *Die Lyrik in der Kunsttheorie der Antike.*

The second criticism would perhaps be less urgent if the indices were fuller, but the subject-index is less than a page in length. Lack of a consolidated bibliography does not make things easier (some sections at least have a bibliography at the end of them). There were also some signs of poor coordination between sections; for example, Simonides' Plataea-poem has found a place in Robbins's account of Simonides (pp. 92–3), but not, as far as I can see, in G.'s general discussion of the occasions of elegiac poetry.

But these criticisms aside, the bottom line must be that this is a very useful book, for which teachers of Greek lyric poetry will long be in G.'s debt, and which deserves a place on the reading lists of all students studying the subject.

University of Reading IAN RUTHERFORD

C. Calame: *Choruses of Young Women in Ancient Greece: Their Morphology, Religious Role, and Social Functions* (Greek Studies: Interdisciplinary Approaches). Pp. xii + 282. Lanham, etc.: Rowman & Littlefield, 1996. Cased, $62.50 (Paper, $24.95). ISBN: 0-8226-3062-1 (0-8226-3063-X pbk).

Claude Calame's classic study, *Les choeurs de jeunes filles en Grèce Archaïque*, was first published in two volumes in 1977. Volume I examined the social and religious functions of female choruses in Archaic Greece from an anthropological perspective, and Volume II was devoted to Alcman's 'first *Partheneion*'. *Choruses of Young Women in Ancient Greece* is a revised and updated version of Volume I. There can be few classicists who are unaware of the impact that C.'s work has had on the study of archaic lyric poetry, and on our understanding of the central importance of choral performance in the cultural life of ancient Greece. But this clear and elegant translation will now enable anglophone readers to appreciate C.'s contribution in all its detail and complexity.

C. begins with an exhaustive treatment of the morphology of archaic choruses, both male and female, analysing them in terms of the number, age, and sex of participants, the relationships between them, the rôle of the *choregos* or chorus leader, and all the formal aspects of choral performance in so far as they can be reconstructed from the literary and iconographical evidence. Female choruses appear to be more common than male, but the poems they performed did not constitute a well-defined genre, rather 'they were composed and performed in response to diverse occasions', and varied considerably according to context. Thus, unlike, for example, the paean or the dithyramb, the partheneion did not exist as a distinct literary category before the Alexandrian period, and even then its definition remained very general.

C. then goes on to set the archaic chorus within the wider frame of its performative context. Considering first its religious aspects, he looks at the range of cults in ancient Greece in which a female chorus would have participated, and then examines in detail the ritual practices associated specifically with the cults of Laconia. Broadly speaking, C. finds that female choruses can be classified according to the characteristics of the deities for whom they performed: so, for example, rites dedicated to Artemis are mainly the preserve of adolescent girls, whereas Aphrodite, goddess of sexuality and desire, and Hera, who presides over marriage and birth, are worshipped by girls on the point of transition from adolescence to adulthood. The divisions between the provinces of these goddesses are by no means clear-cut and vary from cult to cult and from city to city, but what is crucial is that together they mark the key transitional stages in women's lives from pre-puberty to wifehood: birth, growth, adolescence, marriage, maternity. In choral performance participants invoke the aid of the divinities whom they celebrate, and the developing social functions and gender roles of women are validated on the religious level.

But the chorus also has a secular function, for it is through choral performance that the traditional customs and values of society are imparted to the young. C. stresses this educational aspect of the chorus as an institution, which he elucidates by comparison with initiation rites found in tribal societies the world over. Just as these rites prepare adolescents for the rôles that they will take on in adult society, and thus ensure the continuing renewal of that society, so the archaic chorus functions as the instrument through which adolescent boys and girls are integrated

into the adult community, whose values they themselves will go on to perpetuate. In particular it is here that the young are introduced to the customs and norms of adult sexuality, and learn their gender roles—hence the emphasis on sexuality, marriage, and maternity in the choruses of adolescent girls.

C.'s analysis focuses largely on Laconia, but it has far-reaching consequences, not least in relation to the poetry of Sappho. Despite the differences between the activities of lyric choruses in seventh-century Sparta and those of Sappho's circle of companions (e.g. there is a political dimension to the former which has no parallel in Lesbos), both are concerned with female beauty and the expression of homoerotic desire, which C. regards as essentially educative in function. In his view homoeroticism (a term which he prefers to the more loaded 'homosexuality') is one of the most significant features in the passage from childhood to adulthood in ancient Greece, but is a temporary phase through which the adolescent passes in the process of being initiated into the world of adult heterosexuality. The lyric chorus provides a ritual context for the expression of desire where individual feelings are transformed into a collective experience, and the adolescent learns to become both the subject and the object of desire. In Sappho's poetry, no less than in that of Alcman, the lyric 'I' speaks on behalf of the group as a whole and, however personal the feelings may seem, the formulaic nature of the language, combined with oral performance, imparts paradeigmatic value to the experiences described.

C.'s hypothesis that the function of the archaic chorus should be interpreted in terms of initiation rites has not met with universal approval. Eva Stehle, to take one example (*Performance and Gender in Ancient Greece* [Princeton, 1997]), objects that it would be remarkable for a poem such as Alcman's *Partheneion* to be performed by a chorus as part of an initiatory ritual simply for itself; rather, she suggests we should see such poetry as a form of public display, in which young women of marriageable age show themselves off to the community. Again, she argues that the range and variety of Sappho's poems cannot easily be accounted for by a single synthetic theory, and that at least some of them would be more suitable for performance at a female equivalent of the symposium than in the context of initiatory ritual. Such debates about the nature and function of archaic lyric poetry will go on, but what is clear is that C.'s book has profoundly affected the way that we think about these questions, and will continue to do so for many years to come.

University of Warwick PENELOPE MURRAY

D. SLAVITT: *Epinician Odes and Dithyrambs of Bacchylides*. Pp. 83. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998. Cased, £19.95. ISBN: 0-8122-3447-2.

R. STONEMAN (ed.): *Pindar: The Odes and Selected Fragments*. Pp. lvi + 434. London: Everyman, 1997. Paper, £7.99. ISBN: 0-460-87674-0.

There are translations and 'translations'. These versions of Bacchylides' epinicians and dithyrambs by Slavitt, 'poet, novelist, critic, and journalist', the dust jacket tells us, thud into the latter category. *ἄπιστον οὐδὲν, ὅ τι θεῶν μέριμνα / τεύχει* (3.57–8) becomes 'What could Croesus think? Was he glad or angry that what the gods do passes all understanding?'; *χολωσαμένα* (11.53) is 'In a snit'; and Meleager's sad *αἰαῖ* (5.153) is 'aaaaaarrrrghghgh', some sort of baby noise, perhaps. Still, what we read is nicely presented, flows well, and in general acceptably represents the Greek. A pity that the rendering of 1.8 makes not Poseidon but the victor the son-in-law of Nereus, and whether 'Lachon has brought home the bacon' does for *Λάχων . . . λάχε* (6.1–2) is questionable. It is useful to have English versions of Bacchylides readily available, but here readability has sometimes lowered the dignified tone of the original.

Stoneman's updated Everyman translation of Pindar is a scholarly book. He has added to Conway's 1972 translation of the odes a thirty-one-page introduction, copious new notes (frequently referring to modern scholarly articles), and (very usefully) translation of all but the most exiguous fragments. The introduction is excellent. On priamel he points out that even the apparently otiose bits of a priamel ('foil', as some prefer to call them) generally have a meaningful contribution to make to the poem: so, in *O.* 1 all three terms of the crescendo (water, gold, fire)

emphasize the radiance and brightness of the climactic term, the Olympics. Prayers to the gods help Pindar to validate the victor's achievement and give it an 'imperishable significance' (p. xxxvi), while the first-person statements establish Pindar's authority to praise. S. also believes that metaphors from nature (e.g. 'plucking the fruits' of victory) show how victory itself is part of a natural process and hence support Pindar's belief that success depends more on natural talent than on training. The section on myth might have emphasized more how Pindar's myths often contain elements and themes analogous to the victor's achievement, and *N*. 5.19–20 is not explicit enough to support the idea that jumping-weights were used to increase the length of a standing long-jump; my own view (derived from painful practice) is that *more Graeco* they were designed to make the jump harder to perform and so increase the glory of success. Ring-composition brings us a thirty-one-page appendix to the book illustrating how later poets and critics have reacted to Pindar.

University College London STEPHEN INSTONE

G. MATINO: *La sintassi di Eschilo.* (Speculum 19.) Pp. 256. Naples: M. D'Auria, 1998. Cased. ISBN: 88-7092-152-2.

In this useful book M. devotes chapters in turn to gender and number, cases, prepositions, pronouns, adjectives, voice, tense and aspect, mood, noun-verbal forms, subordinate clauses of every type, and the negatives. Her treatment of these matters is painstaking and thorough. Much of her material naturally applies not only to Aeschylus but also to tragic usage in general, and indeed to normal fifth-century Attic Greek. But a short preliminary chapter helpfully summarizes both the archaic features and the new developments which are to be found in Aeschylus, and from time to time she draws attention to differences between Aeschylus and Sophocles and Euripides. Strangely, although she sometimes reveals peculiarities in *PV*, she nowhere mentions that there is any doubt about its authenticity. Many of her comments are sensitive and helpful, e.g. (p. 141) on the sequence of tenses at *Supp*. 538–83 or (p. 113) the different nuances of *τούτου* and *τόνδε* at *Sept*. 1013, but some passages perhaps deserve a fuller treatment, e.g. (p. 96) *Ag*. 1057, where we are merely referred to the commentaries of Denniston–Page and Fraenkel. One would welcome some discussion of the force of *ἀντί-* and *ἀπό-* in compound adjectives. On the 'accusative in apposition to the sentence' Barrett on E. *Hipp*. 752–7 is worth citing.

The text which M. employs throughout is Page's OCT, and, although West's Teubner text appears in the bibliography, there is little sign that she has used it. Occasionally she mentions, and sometimes shows and justifies a preference for, a different reading, usually with reference to one of a limited selection of standard editions of the plays. But too often the reader is given no indication of textual uncertainties, e.g. (p. 179) that the imperatival infinitive at *Cho.* 382 is merely a conjecture of Headlam. Cf. the treatment of *ἐκ* at *Supp*. 86 and *Pers*. 604 (p. 77), *καλεῖ* at *Cho*. 574 (pp. 89, 216), *πρός* at *Supp.* 619 (p. 93), *ὅτε* + optative at *Pers.* 450–1 (pp. 171, 218). Some at least of the transmitted readings which are rejected by Page deserve a comment, e.g. (p. 16) the masculine participle at *Cho.* 629 and (p. 20) the dual at *Cho*. 279.

In her classification of passages there is inevitably room for legitimate disagreement, and M. is well aware of the impossibility of precision. I note a few cases where she seems to me to be simply wrong. Pp. 22 and 23, there are no such words as *λέχον* or *στέρνη*. P. 40, at *Supp*. 635 *βοᾶν* is not accusative, nor (p. 41) is *τᾶσδε μερίμνας* at *Eum*. 360. P. 40, with the reading, *ἀφῃρέθη*, which M. prints at *Cho.* 961, *ψάλιον* is nominative, not accusative. P. 48, at *Ag*. 1418 *ἀημάτων* is surely an objective, not subjective, genitive. P. 50, at *Ag*. 175 *φρενῶν* depends on *τεύξεται*, not on *τὸ πᾶν*. P. 55, at *Cho.* 524 the genitive is governed by *ἐκ* supplied from the previous line. P. 95 n. 263, none of the passages cited by M. has a preposition at line-end. P. 122, at *Ag*. 140 *ἁ καλά* is probably corrupt (see West). P. 176, I do not understand why *Sept*. 790 (*τρέω μὴ τελέσῃ*) is quoted to illustrate verbs of fearing + infinitive. P. 183, at *Pers*. 236 Broadhead was right to doubt the existence of a participle with consecutive force. P. 225, at *Pers*. 565 M. confuses the transmitted *ὡς ἀκούομεν* with Pauw's *εἰσακούομεν* (printed by Page). P. 227 n. 559, *ὡς* + infinitive after a verb of perception gains little support from *Ag*. 1619, where *ἐστί* is to be supplied, or from *Eum.* 799, where the infinitive is probably consecutive.

There are a number of misprints, especially in the printing of the Greek, a few of which may cause trouble. P. 19 n. 32, *μιμουμένω* has become *μιμνουμένω* (and on p. 20 *μινουμένω*). P. 32, for *Ag*. 107–11 read 1007–11. P. 53, at *Ag*. 1321 read *οἰκτίρω*. P. 98, at *Sept*. 930 read

ἐτελεύτασαν. P. 117, at *Ag*. 1108 read τὸν for τὸ. P. 119, at *PV* 301 for πετρερεφῆ read πετρηρεφῆ. P. 131, at *Ag*. 150 read θυσίαν for θύριαν. P. 149, at *Cho*. 142 for τοί read τοῖς. P. 168, at *Pers*. 266–7 read λόγους for λόγος and ἐπορσύνθη for ἐπορσύντο. P. 182, *Ag*. 1024 should be 1204. P. 203, at *Pers*. 708 for μᾶσσον read μάσσων. P. 213, at *PV* 84 for ἀνατλῆσαι read ἀπαντλῆσαι. P. 230, at *Pers*. 216 for θρασύνειν read θαρσύνειν. τ and θ are often interchanged, and from p. 167 onwards Groeneboom appears as Grooneboom.

A full and accurate subject index completes the book, but it is a pity that there is no *index locorum*. The reader who wishes to find out how any particular passage is treated by M. has first to guess at how she is likely to classify it. Some passages in fact appear in more than one place, and M. is not always careful to provide a cross-reference. There is also some repetition. Note 513 (p. 196) is almost exactly the same as note 462 (p. 170).

It would be a pity to end on a negative note. M. for the most part has done her work well, and provided editors, and Aeschylean scholars in general, with a valuable work of reference.

University of Glasgow A. F. GARVIE

M. VÍLCHEZ: *Esquilo: Tragedias, I,* Los Persas: *texto revisado y traducido* (Alma Mater: Colección de Autores Griegos y Latinos). Pp. cxlvii + 68 (double pages). Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1997. Cased. ISBN: 84-00-07697-4.

In the absence of a preface one has to deduce that this is the first volume in a complete edition of the surviving plays of Aeschylus. The bulk of the book consists of a general introduction to Greek tragedy and Aeschylus in particular. This ranges widely, covering such topics as the antecedents of tragedy in lyric and epic poetry, the pre-Aeschylean treatment of myth (but with nothing on the evidence of vase-painting), the life and works of Aeschylus, the historic and socio-political background of his plays, pre-Aeschylean tragedy, Aeschylus' thought, his style, the transmission of the text, and the manuscripts. All of this is handled competently enough, but without providing any startling new insights. References to secondary literature are sporadic and rather dated. It is not clear to me for what readership the book is intended. Students who may require, for example, the summaries of plots will make little of the five pages in which Turyn's stemmata of manuscripts are reproduced. And they should be warned that the origins of tragedy are a controversial subject. The five-page introduction to *Persae* itself deals solely with the formal structure and content of the play, and gives no help to anyone who wants to appreciate it as a drama. For the nature of the tragedy the reader has to refer to the general introduction, in which (s)he will learn (pp. lxxii–lxxiv) that it is a play about power and political justice, in which the institution of monarchy and imperialistic conduct are identified with *hybris*, the democratic system and non-aggressive conduct with *dikê*. It is curious that the list of editions and commentaries on p. 9 omits Broadhead and Belloni, though these names figure in the apparatus and footnotes. Hall presumably appeared too late for V. to use.

V. presents a text of the play that, as he explains in the Introduction, is largely conservative. He has a much looser idea than most editors of what constitutes permissible strophic responsion, and finds no difficulty in printing the impossible τοιῶνδ' ἀρχόντων at the beginning of the trimeter at 330, or a *brevis in longo* in the middle of an anapaestic dimeter at 18. For his apparatus criticus he very reasonably follows that of M. L. West in his Teubner edition, but more selectively and without West's grouping of the codices into families. But the apparatus contains too many misprints, errors, and omissions. I have noted a dozen places where V. prints a conjecture in his text, without giving any indication that it *is* a conjecture. He includes a few emendations of his own, of which ἀμύσσεται (for ἔσ<σ>εται, not ἔσ<ε>ται) is unmetrical. The reporting of O. Müller's transposition of the so-called mesode in the parodos is very confused, as is the treatment of the lacuna at 571. The Spanish translation on the facing page is generally accurate, although in one or two places it is a translation of a different text from that which is printed. I am not qualified to comment on its literary merits. In accordance with the practice of the series there is, regrettably, no commentary—only forty-four very brief notes at the foot of the translation pages. The longest of these (n. 27, but there are two notes so numbered) gives a bibliography of the Battle of Salamis.

University of Glasgow A. F. GARVIE

A. F. GARVIE: *Sophocles* Ajax (Classical Texts). Pp. vi + 266. Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1998. Paper, £16.50. ISBN: 0-85668-660-3.

Until now, the most up-to-date commentaries in English on Sophocles' *Ajax* were those by Kamerbeek (Leiden, 1963) and Stanford (London, 1963). In the thirty-five or so years since they were published, *Ajax* has received much attention. Critics have been interested in the questions the play poses not just about dramatic unity but also about the interplay of Homeric and fifth-century elements, about the relation of theatre and real-life ritual, about details of stagecraft, about the notions of friendship, valour, and madness, and about much else. A. F. Garvie's new edition with introduction, translation, and commentary is therefore more than welcome.

One of the great virtues of G.'s book is that it pays careful attention to the language of the play. The translation is meticulously literal, with the few less literal renderings being explained in the commentary; and the line-by-line notes have much to offer to anybody, whether sixth-former or advanced scholar, who has questions about the meaning and effect of words, phrases, and sentences. See, for instance, 257–8n., on the difficult expression *λαμπρᾶς γὰρ ἄτερ στεροπᾶς / ἄξας ὀξὺς νότος ὣς λήγει*, or 77n., 520–1n., and 1236n. on the frequency of the word *ἀνήρ*. However, G.'s interests are by no means narrowly linguistic. A second strength of his commentary is its sensitivity to the Homeric material that is so important to the understanding of the play. This begins in the introduction (pp. 1–6) with a concise and informative summary of pre-Sophoclean treatments of the Ajax story and continues with many points of detail throughout the notes. 394–5n. on the difference between the Iliadic Ajax, who 'prays to Zeus that he may die not in darkness but in the light' (17.645–7), and the Sophoclean Ajax, who invokes *σκότος ἐμόν φάος*, and 974–1184n. on the contrast between the protection Homer's Ajax gives Teucer (*Il.* 8.266–72) and the efforts that Sophocles' Teucer makes in order to secure Ajax's burial are just two examples. Other matters that appear in a number of notes include stagecraft (e.g. 594–5n., in which G. makes a strong case for thinking that not just Ajax but all individuals depart into the hut after Ajax' rejection of Tecmessa's pleas), ritual (e.g. 1166–7n. on the references to hero-cult in these lines) and formal patterning (e.g. 866–973n. on the complex sequence of arrivals, choral song, lyric dialogue, and trimeters). Some readers may feel that for a commentary with lemmata in English there is a rather large proportion of material aimed largely at those who have Greek, and others might wish for more extensive discussion of theatrical self-consciousness or of the play's place in the world of fifth-century B.C. Athens; but on balance it should be stressed that G.'s commentary has the great merit of combining attention to details of language with an interest in many of the wider questions scholars have pursued in studying *Ajax*.

The general view of *Ajax* that G. puts across in the introduction as well as the individual notes is one of a play which is centred around its protagonist, asking what kind of man he is and why he dies, but which in a number of ways does not offer easy answers. Most emphatically, G. argues that Ajax' fall cannot be explained by simply invoking his *hybris*. This is an attractive approach to the play; by itself, Ajax' rejection of divine help (762–77) cannot provide the key to understanding Ajax and his death. What is perhaps slightly less attractive is the way of looking at Ajax which G. suggests instead. Rather than simply a perpetrator of *hybris*, he maintains, Ajax is a 'Sophoclean hero', that is, a man who 'is cut off from his community, the *polis*, or, in Ajax' case, the army'. And, G. goes on to say, 'in the eyes of his victims his behaviour may seem to be *hybris*, but it is for these qualities that we admire him' (both quotations from p. 14). G. must be right that there is much that Ajax is to be admired for, but to leave it at that is to give rather little weight to all the other characters, who in their different ways present various alternative models of how a 'hero' should act. If nothing else, Ajax' attempt to kill his fellow Greeks, recalled and criticized by various characters at various points in the play, would have been likely to qualify many ancient spectators' admiration for Ajax. Sometimes it might seem that in rejecting the stress on Ajax' *hybris*, G. goes rather far towards defending him. Perhaps *Ajax* is an even more difficult play than G. makes out.

However, criticism would be a false note on which to end. On balance, there can be no doubt that G. has given us an edition of *Ajax* that will be very useful to a variety of readers.

University of Manchester FELIX BUDELMANN

D. J. Conacher: *Euripides and the Sophists. Some Dramatic Treatments of Philosophical Ideas*. Pp. 128. London: Duckworth, 1998. Paper, £12.95. ISBN: 0-7156-2816-X.

The relationship between the ideas which the Sophists discussed and taught and the plays of Euripides is no new subject. There have been serious attempts to come at it from a philosophical standpoint or even to try to deduce what Euripides' own beliefs may have been. A fresh perspective is welcome and is promised in this book: Conacher focuses on the dramatic use which Euripides made of certain key ideas which the Sophists highlighted in public debate and on how the playwright used the ideas rather than whether he believed in them.

The methodology of the book has its limitations (as C. admits in the 'executive summary' provided at the end). Five themes are selected (the nature and teachability of virtue, the relativity of virtue, the power and abuses of rhetoric, reality and sense perception, and the *nomos/physis* controversy), and in each case there is first a brief—sometimes very brief—summary of relevant Sophistic ideas, with quotations and usually references to Diels–Kranz, followed by a discussion of Euripides' use of these themes in one or two selected plays, not in the context of the whole surviving corpus. There are in fact six topics, for the introduction ends with a section on Euripides' use of Sophistic ideas about the gods.

The nature and teachability of virtue is discussed with reference to *Hippolytus*, the relativity of virtue is treated in relation to the notion of *charis* as exemplified in *Alcestis* and *Helen*, rhetoric is introduced with the skimpiest of summaries followed by quite extended and useful sections on *The Trojan Women* and *Hecuba*, reality and sense perception naturally centre on *Helen*, and the *nomos/physis* debate is discussed with reference to *Supplices*, *Heraclidae*, and *Bacchae*. There is a three-page 'Conspectus of Sophists', but a reader would be better advised to consult the *OCD*.

The idea of the book is a good one, for the relationship of a playwright of genius to one of the great movements of European thought can hardly fail to be of interest, and the notion of taking the investigation in terms of what actually happens in the plays is potentially very fruitful. It must be said, though, that this book is only a sketch for such an investigation. There is not much here that has not already been thought and said, and the decision to discuss only one or two plays on each topic leaves a distinct impression of scratching the surface, when what is needed is close and careful reading and a much more thorough analysis of all that is extant. Sketches are, however, handy, and the material drawn together may well be useful for some undergraduate teaching and the ideas may stimulate some more detailed work at graduate level.

There are some misprints and some editorial infelicities, like the quotation from Dodds's *Bacchae* on p. 105 which looks as though it is attributed to Diels, and the two different translations of the same passage in the *Dissoi Logoi* which are introduced with much the same words on pp. 30 and 43. It is also odd to find a Euripidean expert who does not get Valckenaer's name right (he occurs as Valkanaer and Valkenaer, and the unwary reader might think he was thought to be the editor of the *Dissoi Logoi*). Transliteration of Greek is at best a necessary evil and is maddeningly over-used (a reader of a book like this hardly needs to be told that the Greek translated as 'later' is *meta de tauta*).

All in all, a promising theme which needs a larger book and a much more detailed and careful treatment.

Kings College London J. V. MUIR

D. J. Jakob: *Ἡ ποιητικὴ τῆς ἀρχαίας ἑλληνικῆς τραγωδίας*. Pp. 205. Athens: *Μορφωτικὸ Ἵδρυμα Ἐθνικῆς Τραπέζης*, 1998. Paper, 3,500 drachmas. ISBN: 960-250-157-X.

J.'s study of Greek tragedy, part of a series on Greek and Roman poetics, opens by examining how the relationship of tragedians to the Muses differs from that of epic and lyric poets. J. refers the reader to numerous instances of the word 'muse' and its compounds in tragedy and tragic fragments. He concludes that the Muses are related, as in lyric, to music and intellect, but tragedians never present them, or even Dionysus, as the source of their inspiration. Aeschylus' dream, while guarding a vine, that Dionysus encouraged him to compose tragedies (Pausanias 1.21.2), is a literary topos. Sophocles regarded Aeschylus and himself as conscious craftsmen

operating within a literary tradition created by man, not god (Athenaeus 10.428f; Plutarch *Moralia* 79b).

The second chapter considers whether the tragedians question the myth. They see it, J. says, not as matter to be preserved and handed on but as something whose pliancy encourages interpretation in the light of contemporary political, social, and intellectual issues. They regularly modify it in the interests of their particular story, though not to the extent of undermining it. Even Euripides does not show disbelief in traditional myth, but rather disapproval of the ethics it expresses.

In the third chapter, J. discusses the most important emotions that tragedy raises, pity and fear, which are necessary for the audience to experience the peculiar tragic pleasure. J. moves away from psychological and emotional interpretations to argue that tragic events give pleasure because they broaden the experience of the audience and its knowledge of human nature. This knowledge comprises the consciousness that not only the tragic hero, but humanity as a whole, is condemned to have only fragile happiness and limited knowledge or judgement.

The fourth chapter deals with Aristotle's *Poetics*, in particular: (a) Plato's arguments against poetry and their rejection by Aristotle; (b) the components of tragedy; and (c) the absence of lyric poetry from the Aristotelian treatise. Aristotle is mainly concerned with two of the components of tragedy, plot and character, because these are most closely related to the effect of tragedy on spectators' emotions and to the evocation of the tragic pleasure. In addition, they alone can ensure this effect of tragedy when the text is only read and not performed. The discussion on lyric poetry results from the fact that the *Poetics* is largely concerned with tragedy. J. suggests that Aristotle excluded seventh/sixth-century lyric poetry from the *Poetics* because in his scheme of poetic evolution he was particularly concerned to relate drama to epic, and so disregarded the poetry of the intervening centuries.

J. discusses a wide range of literature on his subject, as noted in the bibliography. He presents his own views, well-supported and often innovative, in his customarily clear and systematic way. This is a remarkable scholarly work, of particular value to Greek readers, which adds considerably to the discussion of the poetics of Greek tragedy.

University of St Andrews BARBARA SPINOULA

A. H. Sommerstein: *Aristophanes:* Ecclesiazusae (Classical Texts). Pp. xlv + 242. Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1998. Paper, £16.50. ISBN: 0-85668-708-1 (0-85668-707-3 hbk).

Ecclesiazusae is the penultimate volume of A. H. Sommerstein's series of editions with commentaries of Aristophanes' plays. The introduction of this volume covers all important aspects of the comedy and its background, and gives a lively summary of its plot. Firstly, the historical background is dealt with in detail. This serves as internal evidence for the dating of the play, which S. claims cannot have been performed earlier than in 391. His main arguments for this conclusion are (a) the reference to launching a fleet (197–8), which must have taken place after Conon's dismissal and arrest; and (b) the mention of Heurippides' taxation (823–9) which, some months later, must have been tried and failed already. (For Heurippides' identification, in contrast to the MSS reading 'Euripides', cf. S.'s commentary at 825. However, his taxation does not seem to be mentioned elsewhere.) S. provides other examples from Old Comedy and mythical precedents for Aristophanes' idea of a gynaecocracy. He notes that the idea of a permanent gynaecocratic utopia may have been a novelty. Praxagora's system is compared with that proposed by Pl., *R.* 3 and 5, which, so S., are influenced by *Ecclesiazusae*; the fundamental points are the same in both. S. describes how the political attitudes and problems of Athens in Aristophanes' time, i.e. selfishness and the contrast of wealth and poverty, are reflected in this play, and discusses the success of Praxagora's system, which is shown in particular at 877ff. The effect of this self-contained scene on the audience is also considered. In the following section, S. examines *Ecclesiazusae*'s place in the development of comedy and points out changes from Aristophanes' fifth-century comedies, especially regarding choral and lyrical elements. Then he deals with matters of staging, proposes a possible rôle-distribution for four speaking actors (only three of whom ever appear on the stage at the same time, though), and makes assumptions about costumes. The bibliography is very comprehensive and names all important relevant works.

S. clearly describes the transmission of the text. He is the first one to have been able to employ

the readings of the scholia of *Λ*; so e.g. Bentley's conjecture at 23 is now shown to be an older reading.

The text in this edition is quite different from Vetta's (1989) and Ussher's (1973). S. adopts some conjectures (many more than Vetta), occasionally proposes his own, and sometimes keeps the MSS readings where Ussher did not. In several cases the text is improved (cf. e.g. *προσιουσῶν δευτέραν* 31, *ἡμῶν . . . οἶνου 'ποτείσειν* 44–5, *γε* 86, *ἐπαναβάλεσθε* 276, *αὐτὸς* 307, *προθεῖναι* 397, *ὅσ' ἂν ἀνόητ' ἦ* 474, a lacuna after 560). Sometimes, however, the changes are unnecessary or even disfigure the text (cf. *εἰθισμένοι* 265, *σοι* 330, *ἀρετῆς* 587 [cf. Ussher's explanation], *ἐπινενημέναι* 838 [with *νενασμέναι* 840]). One wonders where *ἐλθεῖν* (686) is taken from. A drawback is the great number of missing, wrong, or misprinted accents and breathings. S.'s allocation of lines to speakers, however, is very convincing.

S.'s apparatus criticus is based on Vetta's. For reasons of restriction of space, S. has to keep his notes rather short and sometimes combines similar readings of the MSS. He leaves out unlikely conjectures and readings.

S.'s translation is very accurate and written in clear English prose. In cases where a literal translation is not possible for idiomatic reasons or where additions are made for a better understanding, this is explained in the commentary, often with information for readers who do not know Greek. S. has found very good English equivalents for Greek puns, e.g. his translation of *ὑπότριμμα* as 'sauce piquante' at 292, the change from 'Kappa' to 'Eta' at 687 for the sake of the joke, and the rendering of the joke and connotation at 720. However, at 100 he does not translate *ὅταν καθῶμεν*, at 856 he could have marked his (helpful but unnecessary) addition 'till you've brought your stuff in', at 1069 his translation of *Διοσκόρω* as 'Sons of Zeus' is strange, and at 266 it would have made more sense to translate 'hand' in the singular (cf. *τὸν ἕτερον βραχίονα* in the next line).

The commentary offers very detailed exegesis of matters of language, metre, historical background, literary history, *Realien*, staging, distribution of speakers, and costumes. S. explains jokes and arguments, provides parallel passages and etymologies of names, and points out tragic quotations and cases of *double entendre.* The commentary is extremely strong at identifying persons who are mentioned in the play and documenting their careers. The notes are very comprehensive and read easily.

All in all, this book is a great source of knowledge and will be very helpful for anyone who studies *Ecclesiazusae.*

University of St Andrews BABETTE PÜTZ

A. H. Sommerstein (ed., trans.): *Aristophanes:* Frogs: *Edited with a Translation and Notes*. (The Comedies of Aristophanes, 9: Classical Texts.) Pp. xiii + 299. Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1996. Cased, £35/$49.95 (Paper, £16.95/$28). ISBN: 0-85668-647-6 (0-85668-648-4 pbk).

Sommerstein's great labour of editing Aristophanes moves towards its conclusion with this ninth volume. Over the nineteen years of the series, the volumes have become more attractively produced and now involve much fuller commentaries, rich in materials for all types of reader. The merits that characterized the earlier volumes are again to the fore. The introduction gives a clear picture of the historical situation of the play, and of how the play weaves together the two story-patterns, of 'descent to the underworld' and 'Dionysus as anti-hero', with the questions concerning the futures of Athens and of tragedy. It also briefly stresses the importance of intertexts with the Eleusinian Mysteries, and broaches the question of the possible revision of the play. The translation succeeds in being both readable and a help with understanding the Greek. The level of accuracy is high: I noticed p. 34 *ἀνδρῶν*, **13** *ποιήσω*, **215** *ἥνιχ' ἀμφὶ*, **501** *Δί' . . . Μελίτης μαστιγίας*, **749** *Δί'*. Only one quibble: the apparatus still seems to me to go beyond what most users of the text will need, without giving enough for those wishing to make serious study of textual questions. Conversely, there are some useful remarks about the nature of the metres of the play, so it might have been useful to have given more complete analyses.

The text is judicious as always, but does not shy away from innovation. I note particularly the following. **133** the revival of Seidler's *εἶνται* 'they're off' (which became by phonetic misspelling *EINTE*, itself then corrupted into the *εἴητε* of Suda and scholia) is attractive: an impatient command from the spectators does not seem necessary here. **182** *αὐτή* Sommerstein: *αὗτη* MSS,

with *νὴ Δία* said by D., makes the expression and speech-divisions here a trifle more natural than in the usual versions. **186** a good defence of *Ὄκνου πλοκάς*. **320** *Διαγόρας* defended against *δι' ἀγορᾶς*, so that the hymns here parody Diagoras' sacrilegious hymns, not the Mysteries themselves. **957** *στρέφειν ἔδραν* Ussher neatly avoids at once intransitive *στρέφειν* and irrelevant love. Less convincing are **335–6** *ὁσίοις <μετὰ>* Kock, based on a something of a quibble, and **1173** *αὖ δὶς* Bake: *αὖθις* MSS.

There are some acute repunctuations and reassignments of speaker. **13–15** question-mark after *ποιεῖν*, to put emphasis on Phrynichus, a rival at this festival, and to obviate problems and emendment in 15. **184** *χαῖρ', ὦ Χάρων* said by Dionysus, Xanthias, and Dionysus and Xanthias together (following an ancient commentator—and perhaps the original staging of Achaeus' play?). **1400** *βέβληκ' Ἀχιλλεύς* may be a genuine quotation from Euripides. **1448** *σωθείημεν ἄν* interjected by Dionysus gives more point to 1449–50.

Perhaps the most interesting textual suggestion concerns the infamous 1435–66. S. adopts his suggestion put forward in S. et al., *Tragedy, Comedy and the Polis* (Bari, 1993), pp. 469–75, which is one the simplest and most elegant solutions proposed. He argues that if we take 1442–50 as from the 404 performance, then the rest can stand unaltered as the text of 405. The very simplicity of this commends it over more complicated theories: as in the other two places where doublets have been suspected, the old and new stand side by side in the text.

S.'s notes are models of concision and good sense, where even quite technical points are handled in a way that is illuminating to the scholar and accessible to the non-specialist. **1198–1247** on the oil-flask and **1235** on a textual point are good examples. S. has a marvellous eye for details and possibilities omitted by others. **376** *ἠρίστηται* suggests that A. knew the play would be put on in afternoon. **814–29** acute analysis of the use of long and short vowels in the descriptions of Aeschylus and Euripides. **1190** that 'in winter' was added for pathos is supported by the fact that no herdsman would have been around the mountains in winter. Only now and then does one feel he goes too far: **1050** is it really necessary for there to have been actual female suicides for this line to work, or real ragged trierarchs for **1066**? In fine, another admirable volume.

The Queen's College, Oxford A. M. BOWIE

A. López Eire: *La lengua coloquial de la comedia aristofánica*. Pp. 211. Murcia: Universidad de Murcia, 1996. Paper, no price given. ISBN: 84-7684-705-X.

López Eire offers a description of the range of expressivity in the iambic parts of Aristophanes' plays. He is especially interested in the colloquial register of Attic Greek and so avoids lyric and parodic passages. He wishes to demonstrate the merits of pragmatics for the study of Aristophanes' language, and displays an evangelical fervour for his method, along with (like the early pragmatists) a perhaps slightly caricatural view of 'academic' linguistics, as interested only in 'la función referente' whilst paying little attention to 'la función expresiva', 'conativa', or 'fática'. He threatens this kind of linguistics with 'un muy negro porvenir' for not concerning itself with the realities of spoken usage (and wittily chides the Real Academia Española for producing the sentence 'la voz pasiva *es* muy poco *usada* en español' [his emphasis], p. 33).

His first chapter highlights passages where intonation, gesture, mime, interchange between speakers etc. require an analysis different from 'academic' linguistic description. It would, however, be a very 'academic' linguist who would deny the importance of studying these features in dramatic texts. One would also have liked L. to have discussed the question of how we identify particular features as 'colloquial': he praises Dover's 'Lo stile di Aristofane' (*QUCC* 9 [1970], 7–23) as having given 'fundamental apoyo' to his work (p. 24 n. 33), but does not discuss the problems raised by Dover there. I am not sure it is quite enough to mark things as colloquial 'porque existen en muchas lenguas ejemplos prácticamente idénticos' or because 'sólo son explicables si se tiene en cuenta la fuerte expresividad del coloquio' (p. 16). The boundary between 'colloquial' and 'formal' is a very porous one. It would have been interesting to have had some comparative and corroborative material from tragedy, prose literature (particularly, say, Plato), and indeed inscriptions, to gain a better idea of where Aristophanic language stands.

Subsequent chapters discuss gesture, intonation, the influence of the situation on meaning and comprehension, interjections, 'los estimulantes conversacionales' (*ἄγε*, *ἴθι*, etc.), deixis, particles, grades of comparison (including diminutives, hypocoristics, etc.), figurative expressions,

repetitions, and syntactic dislocation. The method (and indeed value) of the book lies in the collection of large numbers of examples of the features he isolates, along with carefully nuanced translations into Spanish. The collections do not claim to be comprehensive, but perhaps more complete lists somewhere might have been a good idea. Some of the passages are subjected to close commentary, with others given to develop the insights. Commentary is usually to the point, but at times he overworks his material, as in this comment on *Peace* 524–6 'Cuatro ráfagas de expresividad nos lanza Trigeo . . . Es la entonación la que nos guía haciéndonos percibir la pluralidad dentro de la unidad del texto coloquial, y de paso nos va mostrando tanto el estado anímico del hablante e incluso su carácter (función expresiva), como su voluntad al emitir el mensaje (función conativa)' (p. 64). Sometimes, it must be said, there is a tendency for the chapters to become more like lists, with 'otro ejemplo' etc. used as links between the paragraphs: I am not sure we needed a whole two pages devoted to ἰδού = '¡mira que . . .!' (pp. 102–3). The chapter entitled 'simplificaciones y distorsiones en la gramática y en el léxico: la simplificación fonética' (pp. 79–84) is a rather lengthy discussion of crasis and similar. One would like to have had a more analytical treatment of these features: early on, L. has some interesting remarks about the language of people from different social levels, and it would have been very interesting if he had followed these up with consideration of the distribution of the expressive features he discusses amongst different kinds of speaker and in different circumstances.

Nonetheless, L. gives us a broad view of the expressive range of Aristophanes' language, which will be of especial use to Spanish readers because of its carefulness in rendering the precise nuances of the Greek. (The book is also a rich education in modern Spanish idiom for the non-native speaker!) It is only a pity that the usefulness of the book is rather compromised by the absence of an index of subjects or of passages discussed.

The Queen's College, Oxford A. M. BOWIE

A. Touwaide (ed.), et al.: *Theriaka y Alexipharmaka de Nicandro*. Pp. 370, ills. Barcelona: Moleiro, 1999. Cased. ISBN: 84-88526-29-6.

The transmission of Nicander's works is unusual in that the leading MS (Paris, suppl. gr. 247, of the middle or late tenth century) is richly illustrated. It has attracted a good deal of attention from historians of illumination. The present volume is designed to accompany a facsimile in colour, and consists of six contributions by A. Touwaide, C. Förstel, and G. Aslanoff, which have been translated into Spanish by M. Serrat Crespo; it would be a pity if this fact makes the volume inaccessible to potential readers. There are numerous colour plates of high quality, not all of them strictly necessary; a list of them might usefully have been added to the four indexes.

An opening chapter by Touwaide deals with Nicander and his work (pp. 19–44). Despite the numerous Homeric glosses, T. perhaps insists too much on the Homeric inspiration of the poems (pp. 23, 24, 32); he does not mention Hesiod as the starting-point of so-called didactic poetry. On p. 23 T. sees Nicander as a man of letters playing refined literary games, but he hedges his bets by saying that he may have had a medical education. The section on 'la poética de Nicandro' did not impress me very much. One would like to know where Dante or Shakespeare is indebted to him, as alleged on p. 32; and for the Alexandrian Library (n. 58) it would have been much more informative to cite M. El-Abbadi, *Life and Fate of the Ancient Library of Alexandria* (Paris, 1992^2), than Canfora's book.

The chapter on the history and palaeography of the MS by Ch. Förstel (pp. 47–58) contains a useful reconstruction of its original state. Twenty-nine leaves out of seventy-seven are now missing. An important observation is that the quality of the parchment is uneven. This is rather unexpected in a book which is usually taken to be a luxury product from one of the best scriptoria in the Byzantine capital.

The illumination is dealt with by G. Aslanoff (pp. 62–107). Some elements are strikingly close to ancient wall-paintings: an *insula* at Ostia is mentioned in this context and 'filiación directa' is suggested. But, as is noted on p. 64, ancient art was visible in many places in Constantinople during the Middle Ages, so that it is probably too ambitious to hope for identifications of specific sources. This chapter is a detailed and well-illustrated study including sections devoted to the botanical and zoological miniatures. Among various points of interest one may note that the colours do not always match Nicander's statements.

T. then discusses Nicander in relation to other medical writers of antiquity and early Byzantium (pp. 111–55). Dioscorides looms large here, as there are famous illustrated MSS of his

book. I did not find the discussion easy to follow on pp. 130f. What the reader would appreciate here is a clear suggestion as to which MS of Dioscorides is most accurately illustrated and what its relation is to the Parisinus.

The translation of the Greek text, on which I do not venture to comment, is followed by notes divided into two categories. First come the general notes on the two poems, pp. 198–231 and 262–86; these are for the most part short and fairly elementary, which is no bad thing in view of the allusiveness and difficulty of Nicander's text; T. gives a good deal of technical scientific information, citing from various works that have appeared since Gow and Scholfield's edition. The philological notes follow separately on pp. 289–99 and 301–18. They show a marked tendency to follow the proposals and interpretations put forward by H. White, *Studies in the Poems of Nicander* (Amsterdam, 1987); the treatment of technical difficulties will be too conservative for some tastes.

Many of the notes, especially those on the *Theriaka*, are brief statements of a preference for one reading or interpretation in preference to another. Those on the *Alexipharmaka* contain a larger element of discussion. It is possible that they would have been more suitable for publication as a periodical article.

From time to time one encounters worrying oddities in the notes, e.g. p. 213 n. 119 states that Demeter is equivalent to an ancient divinity of Thessalonica; p. 262 n. 3 Cyzicus is said to be on the Black Sea; p. 292 n. on *Ther*. 283 asserts that ἀμβαθμούς means 'inaccessible'; p. 301 T. seems to be saying that ταρασσομένη is the reading of all the MSS, which is not claimed by Gow–Scholfield or White, and in fact this variant should probably be considered a gloss. But despite the lapses of this type, the notes will need to be taken into account by anyone who works on these texts in future; however, if the volume is not sold separately from the facsimile it will not be easily accessible.

Lincoln College, Oxford N. G. WILSON

M. D. USHER: *Homeric Stitchings. The Homeric Centos of the Empress Eudocia*. Pp. x + 173. Lanham, etc.: Rowman & Littlefield, 1998. Paper, £15.95. ISBN: 0-8476-9050-4.

The poems of the Empress Eudocia (d. 460; *PLRE* II s.v. 2), estranged wife of Theodosius II, have found few admirers since Photius (*Bibl*. codd. 183–4) and Aldus Manutius. Arthur Ludwich abandoned his perusal of the sole manuscript (Par. suppl. gr. 388; tenth century) of the Homeric centos on which his 1897 edition is based, publishing only 490 lines of the surviving 1943. U.'s book, a spin-off from his 1998 Teubner edition (based on a different manuscript, the fourteenth-century Athos Iviron 4464: see *AJP* 1997), sets Eudocia in an entirely fresh light, as direct descendant of the Homeric rhapsodes.

Eudocia's biblical poems (her verse paraphrase of part of the Old Testament, is lost, but the poem on St Cyprian is partially extant) exemplify the urge to create a Christian literature on a par with the ancient classics which was manifest intermittently in the fourth to fifth centuries. Eudocia employed two distinct techniques: the versification of a prose text—where Photius praised her faithfulness to the original, though modern critics have judged her work technically inferior to the slightly later Ps.-Apollinarius of Laodicea (Psalms) and Nonnus (St John's Gospel) —and the deployment of Homeric lines to create an original rendering of the Gospel story. In the latter, choice is exercised both in the selection of lines and in material, which draws on different Gospels and goes beyond them. The closest large-scale parallel are Proba's Virgilian centos, probably composed in response to Julian's educational legisation (Green, *CQ* 1995). For the highly literate Eudocia, who spent her last twenty years in exile in Jerusalem performing good works, pious pastime may have been sufficient motivation.

Nor is Homer Eudocia's sole co-author. A prefatory epigram explains that she reworked and completed a text begun by Patricius (?late fourth century), while the Paris manuscript also associates Optimius and Cosmas (?Cosmas of Jerusalem; eighth cent.) with the cento collection. Multiple authorship is complicated by a complex manuscript tradition: many versions have a text 650–700 lines long, Ludwich's Paris manuscript has 1943, and the Iviron and Renaissance group (on which the Aldine edition is based) a yet longer version. U.'s contention that the Iviron represents Eudocia's elaboration of Patricius is controversial: R. Schembra (*Sileno* 21) attributes the long Renaissance version to Patricius and Ludwich's text to Eudocia, while A.-L. Rey (*Centons homériques*, Sources chrétiennes 437, 1998) accepts multiple authorship in Ludwich's manuscript. This poses a fundamental problem for discussion of Eudocia's individual art.

U. explores two major hypotheses: first that cento composition is a creative rhapsodic art in which the poet, relying on complete recall of the Homeric poems, weaves her *parole* from the *langue* of Homer, assisted by keywords which prompt navigation between different Homeric passages. Second, U. argues that the original context of the centoed lines is significant: Eudocia's rendering of the death of Christ, for example, resonates against its source-passages—the deaths of Hector and Patroclus in the *Iliad*. The latter point may gain force from the use of blocks of two or more consecutive Homeric lines, a practice rejected by Latin centonists (another view: Rey [1998], pp. 36f.). Elsewhere, U. argues, Eudocia evokes a frisson of *Verfremdung* by contrasting the Gospel story with its Homeric medium.

U.'s thesis overturns standard views about late-antique classical culture, which emphasize shrinkage of knowledge and the bookishness with which a few clung to vestigial snippets of information. While it is plausible that Eudocia, personally educated by her father the Athenian sophist Leontius (Soc. 7.21.8), knew Homer by heart, U.'s thesis of sensitive intertextuality marries uneasily with her limited technical proficiency and with other evidence for Byzantine approaches to Homer. U. faces the charge of imposing an anachronistically modern approach. Furthermore, in cento composition a particular Gospel theme must inevitably direct the poet to parts of the base text where similar material can be found (hence Odyssean reception of a stranger for the Annunciation, Iliadic battle-scenes for the Crucifixion).

U. provides a useful study of techniques of cento composition in Part 2 and brings a refreshing application of recent Homeric scholarship and literary theory to an ill-regarded text. For Ausonius centonism was a game, but U. demonstrates that Eudocia's art merits serious analysis, as now underlined by the meticulous work of Rey. U.'s contention that hers is 'a powerfully comparative reading of Homer and the Bible' analogous to the work of Dante (pp. 144f.) is overstated, but a salutary counter to Gibbon's dismissive 'insipid performance'.

King's College London MARY WHITBY

P. J. RHODES (ed.): *Thucydides*: History IV.I–V.24 (Series of History). Pp. ix + 343, 6 maps. Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1998. Paper, £17.50. ISBN: 0-85668-702-2.

Partial duplication in the Aris & Phillips series? J. Wilson's *Pylos 425 BC: Book IV, 2–41* (1979) and the latest of Rhodes's commentaries on Thucydides both belong, according to the back cover of R.'s volume, to the same 'Series of History'. But while Wilson's volume, like R.'s, includes text and translation, it is more for the specialist (*A Historical and Topographical Study of Thucydides' Account of the Campaign* was the original, and better, subtitle of a book that does not include either 4.7 or 4.24–5). R. focuses more broadly on the 'war which formed Thucydides' subject-matter and on the way in which he has treated the subject', and he treats both themes well. R. offers general background information as well as pertinent notes on historical and topographical controversies (he resists Wilson's unorthodox view of the Pylos harbours; but better maps are needed to make sense of, say, Brasidas' Lynkestian campaign). And he discusses succinctly the eccentricities traditionally seen in Thucydides' handling of the Peloponnesian War—though he does not always attempt to explain those perceived eccentricities (a failing which mars slightly his otherwise excellent treatment of the theme of reversal in the Pylos narrative). Still, students will appreciate R.'s edition for its concise summaries of important information, and also for its lucid translation.

What of the exact duplication of the second volume of Simon Hornblower's (henceforth H.) *Commentary on Thucydides* (Oxford, 1996)? There is inevitably an (interesting) 'intertextual' relationship between R.'s volume and H.'s. At 4.85.1, for instance, R.'s note on the abstract noun ἔκπεμψις, and his translation 'the sending-out of me and my army', pick up, with some acknowledgement, H.'s note and translation. At 4.85.5, R. echoes, without acknowledgement, and with a certain scepticism, H.'s note on an unobtrusive hexameter. And R.'s occasional use of 'focalisation' in quotation marks could perhaps be read as inspired by (or even focalized through?) H., whose literary and narratological interests are more pervasive. R. is, however, prepared to take issue with H. on literary matters. His objections do not turn on the relation of literary motifs to historical reality: both R. and H. are prudent (see, e.g., R.'s note on 4.25.2). Rather, they often turn on the issue of authorial intention. Thus he argues against H.'s view that Thucydides deliberately postpones his explanation of Brasidas' campaign for dramatic effect: 'we are not yet far from the oral style of writing which avoids cross-references, and more probably,

here as often, Thucydides has simply chosen to mention Brasidas' purpose at the point where it is most relevant.' (See also R.'s nn. on 4.66.1 and 5.16.3.) But perhaps R. and H. are simply describing the same phenomenon in slightly different terms: Thucydides gives information when it is most relevant, and so is increasingly precise about some events. Elsewhere R. does have good insights of his own on literary topics: for instance, he well points out how the word-order at 4.24.5 is adapted to the content; and he often notes techniques such as ring-composition, even using this technique to argue (rightly, in my view) against the translation of 4.58 offered by Gomme and H.

While R.'s commentary does overlap H.'s, the fact that it includes text and translation may help to make a slightly understudied section of Thucydides more attractive for school and university courses. If so, that will be some reward for the excellent work of both H. and R. on this section of the text. But, valuable as R.'s volume is, Aris & Phillips would surely have done better to ask him to produce a rival to Dover's school editions of Books 6 and 7.

The Queen's College, Oxford TIM ROOD

P. HUNT: *Slaves, Warfare, and Ideology in the Greek Historians*. Pp. xiv + 246. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. Cased, £37.50. ISBN: 0-521-58429-9.

This book has a simple argument: that the rôle of slaves in ancient Greek warfare has been greatly underestimated, and that this is the result of an ideological blind spot on the part of the Greek historians Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon. In a world in which political power and military value were often identified, in which the image of the slave carried with it a number of pejorative associations, and in which an often fragile civic unity depended on the maintenance of a strict opposition between the free citizen and the slave, the participation of slaves in warfare was an awkward reality that could be referred to at best only fleetingly.

Hunt collects and discusses anew all the evidence for 'fighting slaves' from the Persian wars to the foundation of Messene and the 'decline of hoplite ideology' in the fourth century. In the course of doing so, he takes regular swipes at those who have sought to explain away the scattered ancient evidence, for example by relegating slaves to the baggage train of ancient armies. An important passage of the book also discusses the 'recruitment and rebellion' of slaves during wartime, challenging the common view of wartime as a 'loyalty test' of slaves' real feelings, positing instead a more complex model of a 'bidding war' (pp. 115–120). H.'s discussion throws up a number of interesting details—a good suggestion, for example, for how Herodotus came up with the figure of 35,000 Helots at Plataea (p. 36). It also highlights some interesting ideological contradictions and fissures. H. points out, for example, how the rhetoric of Brasidas was highly inappropriate for an army consisting of Helot soldiers (pp. 58–9), or how Thucydides reserves the name 'Messenians' for the Messenians of Naupactus whilst terming the Spartans' subject Messenians 'Helots' (p. 68); more generally, he traces an ambivalence in Athens over the Spartans' domination of the Helots (pp. 76–82). He also excavates a stark contrast in Xenophon's literary output between the world of the *Cyropaedia* in which slave participation in warfare is anathema and the *Ways and Means* in which he recommends that the Athenians should free slaves in the event of invasion; H. argues convincingly that this recommendation should be seen as perfectly consonant with Greek thinking and practice.

The history of a historiographical silence is perhaps bound to be hard reading, bound to be heavy with repetition, scholarly dispute, and speculative in-fill. It has to be said, however, that the author does little to ease his reader's task. The direction of the argument is frequently inadequately signposted. The views of named scholars are often unnecessarily foregrounded. Sentence length seems almost never to vary. H.'s first-person interventions—to point out, for example, those areas where he has and has not developed 'original arguments' (p. 43)—are usually clumsy. Citations of secondary scholars seem implicitly to grant these figures an almost god-given authority: Gomme argues that 'Sparta could not have won the Ionian war' without its Neodamodeis (p. 60), Funke, Strauss, and Ober, we are told, 'all emphasize the relative harmony of the Athenian democracy' (p. 133)—to which statements, unsupported by evidence and taken out of context, one can only reply 'who cares?'.

Stylistic rigidity is accompanied also by a stifling subordination of all other issues to one narrow thesis. I cannot see how the presence in Thucydides' world view of oppositions, such as that between word and deed or 'truth and the opinions of many', should make the historian more likely to exclude fighting slaves from his history in order to bolster another opposition, that

of free men and slaves (p. 130). H. is not the man for 'narratological' nuance, as bland pronouncements on Thucydides—'interested in discovering the true causes of events' (p. 55), with 'aims in addition to neutral narration' (p. 14), 'a deliberate writer [whose] . . . omissions are not unmotivated' (p. 73), from whom we are 'not required to deny . . . objectivity entirely' (p. l4')—demonstrate. Cornford's reading of Thucydides 'Mythistoricus' is first oversimplified and then rejected as providing a less satisfactory explanation of the historian's allegedly unsatisfactory account of Pylos than the argument that Thucydides was unwilling to highlight slave revolts (p. 75). H. finally turns about to acknowledge that it would be simplistic to see this as the sole cause. H.'s ascription of the birth of political philosophy to the decline of the hoplite citizen is similarly confused and puzzling (pp. 201–2). Plato and Aristotle are reduced startlingly to the spokesmen of an 'elitist dissatisfaction with a society based upon . . . military prowess' (p. 220). The discussion of the comparative cases of Rome, medieval Islam, and the Confederate South are all interesting in themselves, but would surely have better served his purpose if integrated into the book's argument than in a discrete concluding chapter. H.'s dalliances with the work of Clifford Geertz and Mary Douglas, on the other hand, add nothing to this book beyond a false sheen. His comparison of his subject with Levitican dietary prohibitions ('fighting slaves tend not to be written just as pigs could not be eaten', p. 129) is a pointless exercise in intellectual dot-to-dot (cf. pp. 19–25, 131, 153).

None of these flaws—born in part, one suspects, out of a misguided attempt to advertise the wide relevance of the book—lessen the importance of its central subject matter, but they will obscure it.

University College London THOMAS HARRISON

J.-F. PRADEAU (trans.): *Platon:* Alcibiade. Pp. 243. Paris: G. F. Flammarion, 1999. Paper, frs. 39. ISBN: 2-08070988-7.

The dialogue presented here is the so-called *Greater Alcibiades*, or *Alcibiades I*, the longer of the two dialogues bearing the name *Alcibiades* that are found in the Platonic corpus. This dialogue was a great favourite in antiquity: it was often, and with good reason, commended as the very best place at which to start reading Plato. In the nineteenth century, however, Schleiermacher condemned it as bogus. In consequence, it largely vanished from view. Pradeau and Chantal Marboeuf, his co-translator, are to be commended for helping to bring it back.

Their translation sometimes skips words and phrases: thus 124a *οἱ πάντες βασιλῆς γεγόνασιν* is not translated at all, and 133e *ἑνός τε καὶ μιᾶς τέχνης* is translated simply by 'd'une seule et même technique'. Sometimes they overtranslate: thus 132c *αὐτό* becomes 'ce qu'est «soi-meme»'. There is an occasional neglect of Greek idiom: thus 110a *τρίτον δ' ἔτος καὶ τέταρτον καὶ πέμπτον* is translated as 'il y a trois, quatre ou cinq ans', as if French, like Greek, counted years inclusively. However, the only error I have noticed which makes a substantial difference to the philosophical argument is at 106d (*οὐκοῦν ταῦτα μόνον οἶσθα, ἃ παρ' ἄλλων ἔμαθες ἢ αὐτὸς ἐξηῦρες;*). This is rendered as 'Ces choses, les connais-tu uniquement par d'autres, ou les as-tu découvertes par toi-même?', which (unless I have misunderstood the French) conveys the message 'Do you know these things only from other people, or have you discovered them for yourself?', rather than 'Isn't it the case that you know only those things that you have either learnt from other people or discovered for yourself?'

The translation is supplemented by 167 notes, explaining allusions, citing parallels and secondary literature, and sometimes commenting on the choice of text and translation. These notes are all the more welcome in that, while we have lots of ancient commentary on the *Alcibiades*, the dialogue has yet to receive, in any modern language, a commentary of the sort that readers of most other Platonic dialogues can take for granted.

Welcome for the same reason are the seventy-three pages of introduction prefixed to the translation. The introduction consists mainly of short expository and critical essays that elucidate the dialogue section by section. The introduction also discusses topics relating to the dialogue as a whole (e.g. the career of Alcibiades, the dramatic date).

In particular, the introduction argues that Plato indeed wrote the *Alcibiades*, and that he wrote it after the *Charmides*, at more or less the same time as the *Gorgias*, and incontestably earlier than the *Republic.* The sequence *Charmides*, *Gorgias*, *Republic* is standard enough, and P. adopts it without comment. He does, however, argue for his placing of the *Alcibiades* within this sequence. His argument is based on the way the *Alcibiades* treats the moral, psychological, and political

questions which all four dialogues discuss. Thus his dating at least avoids relying on the fantastic assumption made in stylometric arguments, that the author of the *Symposium* had so little control over his prose that difference in style correlates with difference in date. However, it is not obvious to me that we improve much on stylometry if we argue that the *Gorgias* and the *Alcibiades* must have been written at about the same time, because they complement one another intellectually. At any rate, there is one body of philosophical writing (my own) with whose dates I am well acquainted, and which such arguments would badly misdate. Indeed, I am not even certain that the familiar chronology which has 'Socratic' dialogues like the *Charmides* before the *Gorgias*, and the *Gorgias* before the *Republic* (a chronology which was not devised until after the exclusion of the *Alcibiades* from the canon, and which is taken for granted in P.'s discussion, as in so many others) can survive the reinstatement of the *Alcibiades.* For it is not, I think, accidental (however irritatingly it may beg the question) that arguments against authenticity sometimes turn on the difficulty of fitting the *Alcibiades* into the familiar chronology. Still, it would be churlish to make these scruples of mine grounds for complaint against a useful piece of work, that any student of the *Alcibiades* will wish to consult.

Trinity College, Cambridge NICHOLAS DENYER

C. D. C. Reeve (trans.): *Plato:* Cratylus. Pp. liii + 103. Indianapolis and Cambridge: Hackett Publishing, 1998. Paper, £9.95. ISBN: 0-87220-416-2.

J. H. Nichols Jr (trans.): *Plato:* Gorgias. Pp. xi + 149. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1998. Paper, £9.95. ISBN: 8014-8527-4.

J. H. Nichols Jr (trans.): *Plato:* Phaedrus. Pp. xi + 107. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1998. Paper, £9.95. ISBN: 8014-8532-0.

E. Brann, P. Kalkavage, E. Salem (trans.): *Plato's* Phaedo (Focus Philosophical Library). Pp. 110. Newburyport, MA: Focus Publishing Co., 1998. Paper, £8.95. ISBN: 0-941051-69-2.

A. Sharon (trans.): *Plato's* Symposium (Focus Philosophical Library). Pp. 76. Newburyport, MA: Focus Publishing Co., 1998. Paper, £8.95. ISBN: 0-941051-56-0.

Reeve's translation of the *Cratylus* is particularly welcome. Although the dialogue deals with important philosophical issues, including Heraclitean flux, Protagorean relativism, the theory of forms and, above all, the relation of language to reality, it is one of Plato's least known dialogues. There are a number of reasons for this neglect. A large part of the dialogue is taken up with speculative etymologies, which interest few modern readers. In other parts of the dialogue the subject matter may seem too austerely philosophical for the general reader and for those whose interests are primarily literary. Even philosophers have sometimes been embarrassed by the difficulty of fitting the dialogue into any neat scheme of Plato's development. It is nevertheless remarkable that Reeve's is the first new English translation since Fowler's Loeb edition of 1926. Fortunately R. has done an excellent job. His version is not slavishly literal but is in general very accurate. It is also very clear and readable. R. is particularly to be congratulated for having produced versions of some of the more tortuous passages, which are not only faithful to the text but also make good sense in English. The long and detailed introduction is well worth reading in its own right. In this R. contrasts

Hermogenes' theory that names are purely conventional 'tags' with Cratylus' view of names as 'keys' which must fit the nature of things. His detailed analysis shows how the dialogue reveals the shortcomings of both theories while indicating that an adequate account of naming must contain elements of both. In doing so he enables the reader to see the *Cratylus* as a serious contribution to what we would now call the philosophy of language, but he avoids distorting Plato through anachronistic references to modern theories.

Nichols's versions of the *Gorgias* and the *Phaedrus* are motivated by a very different interpretative strategy from that of Reeve. N. evidently accepts the Straussian view that we can find in Plato's writings a political philosophy which is not stated overtly but has to be read between the lines. To discover the meaning of a dialogue we have to pay attention not so much to the explicit arguments as to the dramatic structure and to 'surface features'. This emphasis on surface features means that translations have to be literal, reproducing so far as possible the vocabulary, word order, and sentence structure of the original. I have to confess that I am very suspicious of the Straussian method of interpretation and of the kind of translation that it produces, but anyone who shares N.'s aims will, I am sure, think his translations highly successful. Because they are very literal they are not particularly idiomatic or easy to read, but they are always intelligible. N. uses the same introduction for both dialogues but provides a separate 'interpretive essay' for each. He stresses that both dialogues are concerned with rhetoric, and explores not only what they say overtly about that subject but also the 'public and private rhetoric' which he takes to be implicit in the dialogues themselves. This approach is very different from that of analytic philosophers, who have tended to see the *Gorgias* in particular as offering arguments for a Socratic or Platonic moral philosophy. But N. is surely right to suggest that rhetoric is a central theme of these dialogues, and that we should not content ourselves with the idea that Plato is unremittingly hostile to rhetoric as such. Although Plato criticizes the orators of his day in the early sections of the *Gorgias* and elsewhere in his writings, the latter part of that dialogue implies that there can be a right kind of rhetoric. This seems to be a major concern of the *Phaedrus.* There is therefore a point in reading the two dialogues together. So, although these volumes will appeal most strongly to those who share the translator's principles of interpretation, they do have something to offer readers who do not share those preconceptions.

The Focus Library edition of the *Phaedo* is apparently based on principles of interpretation similar to those espoused by Nichols, but I am less happy about the way in which these principles are put into effect. Brann and her colleagues begin their introduction by noting (rightly) that the arguments of the *Phaedo* seem full of logical flaws. They could reasonably take this to indicate that we should not see the *Phaedo* simply as an attempt to prove the immortality of the soul. But unfortunately the interpretation they offer is full of what I would regard as wild and unscholarly speculations. For example, on the strength of the fact that the opening word of the dialogue is αὐτός, which they take to mean 'self', they argue that the dialogue is concerned with the self. But, of course, there is no Greek word for the 'self'. In fact, many scholars would say that the question of the identity of the self is not one which troubled ancient Greek thinkers, and that, in any case, the modern concept of the self is philosophically questionable. I am also unhappy about the translation. This generally sticks closely to the text, though it is slightly less literal than those by Nichols. Unfortunately there are a number of passages where the translation, if not exactly erroneous, is nevertheless seriously misleading. One example is at 58b6, where Phaedo is made to say that it is the Athenian practice 'to execute no one publicly' until the sacred ship has returned from Delos. This makes it sounds as though there was a ban on public executions (as opposed to ones conducted in private), but that could hardly have affected Socrates since he was, of course, put to death in prison. What the phrase δημοσίᾳ μηδένα ἀποκτεινύναι really means is that no one is put to death by the state.

The other volume from the Focus Library, Sharon's translation of the *Symposium*, is very different. S. makes it clear that, in his view, a translation of this dialogue must give attention to literary character and form as well as content, and he announces his intention to underline the dramatic elements in the work by accentuating the verbal characterization (sometimes verging on ridicule). The translation is fairly loose by present-day standards, but it is generally reliable. Of all the translations discussed in this review this is certainly the one that is most stylish and enjoyable to read. The introduction is clear, sensible, and straightforward, and there are useful footnotes. It would be a good choice for any reader who is interested in the *Symposium* as a work of literature and is not too concerned with literal accuracy.

University of Glasgow R. F. STALLEY

A. J. Bowen (ed., trans.): *Xenophon:* Symposium (Classical Texts). Pp. viii + 146. Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1998. Cased, £35 (Paper, £13.25). ISBN: 0-85668-681-6 (0-85668-682-4 pbk).

This is the first edition with a commentary in English for over a century. The text is Marchant's (OCT, 2nd edn), tidied up. There is a vocabulary. The introduction and commentary operate on several levels. They provide for Greekless readers who rely on the translation alone, for students fresh from an *ab initio* Greek course, and for the more experienced. Bowen explains fully Xenophon's background and that of the participants at the banquet, and defends Xenophon as a stylish and influential writer, appreciated by ancient critics (though on 9.7 B. acknowledges Plato's superiority). The commentary is full of good things, e.g. the notes which relate Xenophon's style to Plato's at 4.25 and 56.

B. (intro., p. 8) follows Thesleff (*BICS* 25, 157–168) in saying that Xenophon's *Symposium* was the earlier, although revised especially in Chapter VIII (Socrates' discourse on Eros) in the light of Plato's *Symposium*. This has not been the general view; perhaps the relationship between the two *Symposia* was more complex. B.'s note on 8.32 shows not only that Socrates' discourse is influenced by Plato's *Symposium*, but also that the text Xenophon referred to differed from ours or was misquoted from memory. Thesleff concluded that our present text of Xenophon's *Symposium* consists of two layers: a brief earlier version and a later version influenced by Plato. How brief Xenophon's first version was and whether it was actually written before Plato's *Symposium* may never be known. The contrast in content matters more; we may suppose (Dover, *Plato: Symposium*, intro., p. 10) that the historical Socrates did not talk about beauty in the terms which Socrates uses in Plato's *Symposium*, and that it has intellectual importance in marking a stage in the enunciation of the theory of ideas; Xenophon, at the outset, claims familiarity with the participants at his *Symposium*, and its importance, as an account of their manners, is historical.

The translation into elegant contemporary English contains many felicities, e.g. *αὐτουργούς τινας τῆς φιλοσοφίας*: *do-it-yourself philosophers* (1.5), and is often thought-provoking; for instance, is Socrates at 4.5, cutting short his waspish follower Antisthenes, who is attempting to catch Callias out in argument, meant to be contrasted with Socrates in the early Platonic dialogues?

English readers are in B.'s debt for restoring an important Classical text to life.

University of Warwick FRANK BEETHAM

P. Briant (ed.): *Dans les pas des Dix-Mille: Peuples et pays du Proche Orient vus par un Grec. Actes de la Table Ronde internationale organisée à l'initiative du GRACO Toulouse, 3–4 février 1995*. (Pallas: Revue d'études antiques 43.) Pp. xv + 302, 26 ills. Toulouse: Presses Universitaires du Mirail, 1995. Paper, frs. 160.

Focused on the description of peoples and landscapes, the sixteen essays presented in this volume discuss the value of Xenophon's *Anabasis* for historians and archaeologists. Briant's comment (p. xiv), that the *Anabasis* provides a source of information about the Near East, is partially challenged by P. Brulé's claim that Xenophon's observations of peoples and landscapes are subject to a Greek-orientated view, which limits his interest and determines his judgement on natural phenomena and people unknown to him. Are Xenophon's observations comprehensive and accurate descriptions, or are they notes limited to his concern for the survival of his army, i.e. the basic foodstuffs, water supplies, and sufficient geographical intelligence to avoid conflict?

These questions are addressed in M.-F. Baslez's detailed study of the rivers and waterways, which determined Xenophon's route, as well as in P. Debord's discussion of the royal roads for the movements of the Ten Thousand. B. Tripodi focuses on the cultural implications of food and eating, while S. Amigues produces a thorough analysis of the vegetation as observed by Xenophon. M. Gabrielli (on logistics and transport) and R. Descat (on payment for mercenaries) look at the ways in which the food and monetary supplies were secured for Cyrus' army.

Amendments to Xenophon's observations are made based on written and archaeological

sources. W. Stolper's article on Neo-Babylonian evidence for the career of Belšunu, Xenophon's Belesys, informs on the status of a local satrap. A. Kuhrt challenges the view supported by Xenophon, that Assyrian civilization had vanished completely following its destruction in 614 and in 612 B.C. Arguing that a Babylonian takeover of Assyrian structures is more likely, Kuhrt's list of the archaeological evidence, although slight, reveals a continued occupation of many of the Assyrian cities. Most notably, she argues that the 'traditional' identification of Larissa and Mespila as Kalhu and Niniveh ought to be challenged. P. Zimansky's article explains the absence of any mention of Urartu in Xenophon's text, arguing that it was due to the type of kingdom Urartu was—a conglomerate of heterogeneous peoples held together by the military and political force imposed by its kings, which, lacking any cultural uniformities, vanished with the defeat of the Urartian king by the combined forces of the Medes and Scythians in the mid-seventh century B.C.

Archaeological data adding to the understanding of the text are provided by T. Bakir, who reports on the ongoing excavations at Daskyleion, the satrapal seat of Pharnabazos, whose palace was destroyed by Agesilaos in 395 B.C. H. Gasche discusses the archaeological evidence for Xenophon's 'Median Wall', which in fact was built by Nebuchadnezzar II (604–562 B.C.), while C. H. Greenewalt surveys the evidence of the satrapal seat of Sardis. By stating that despite the predominantly Greek archaeological evidence for Sardis, it is nevertheless possible to trace Anatolian traditions, and to identify Persian designs in luxury goods, he raises the question to what extent Greek culture existed in Sardis.

Most illuminating are the articles by F. Joannès and O. Casabonne. The latter's re-examination of the coinage of Cilicia leads to the conclusion that there is no evidence for a political change there after 401 B.C., but that we ought to distinguish between a local or civic coinage minted by the *syennesis* with the approval of the king, whose authority he acknowledged, and a military coinage minted by Pharnabazos. Joannès's article succeeds in discussing the Greek evidence and Babylonian cuneiform texts in a syncretic analysis of the region of the mid-Euphrates and northern Babylonia, confirming the Near Eastern evidence of the more rural regions of northern Babylonia as opposed to the urbanized south, as well as stressing the existence of village communities in Mesopotamia in the Achaemenid period.

The present volume has focused on the contents of the Greek text, analysing how Xenophon perceived the natural environment through which he passed and investigating the extent of his understanding of the western part of the Persian empire. The archaeological reports on Dascyleion and Sardis have complemented our knowledge about the sites, while others highlighted the regions Xenophon traversed and commented on their political background at the end of the fifth century. To what extent have these discussions contributed to our understanding of the *Anabasis*? How much historical information can be yielded from the text about Achaemenid Persia at the end of the fifth century B.C.? P. Brulé's concerns may well be appropriate when he states that Xenophon's Hellenocentric view limits his understanding of the peoples he encounters and the landscapes he experiences. In the case of Joannès's contribution, the author successfully combined and integrated knowledge from Neo-Babylonian sources about the western part of the Achaemenid empire of the late fifth century with the information we can extract from the *Anabasis*. But does the text generally provide a source of information on the Near East, as Briant stated? Further questions might have aided the approach to the text: who was it written for and, perhaps more importantly, as M. Fales asks in the concluding remarks, how much of it was written down on the march and what are later reminiscences? What was the reason for writing if up in the first instance? In answer to the latter question, the *Anabasis* was perhaps ultimately written to record a Greek military achievement, and to describe the Greek mercenaries' struggle for survival, their goal to return to their homeland, after the ordeal of marching through alien and hostile territory. Patriotism is certainly an element of the *Anabasis.* Surprisingly, perhaps, no one took up what must have been a problem already faced by Xenophon himself: to explain why Greeks are fighting for Persian kings or aspiring kings in the first place—an ideologically intriguing problem which could be considered in further discussions of the *Anabasis.*

Centre for the Study of Ancients Documents, Oxford M. BROSIUS

D. KEYT (trans.): *Aristotle:* Politics *Books V and VI*. Pp. xvii + 265. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999. Paper, £14.99. ISBN: 0-19-823536-4.

Aristotle in *Politics* V and VI presents an account, based on extensive historical research, of the nature of the change and preservation of constitutions. As such, it is interesting not only for the

many philosophical questions it addresses, but also for its perennial relevance in a world of political instability.

For all that, however, Books V and VI do not form the most verdant philosophical pastures of the *Politics*, dry and scattered as the discussion sometimes is. So the fact that K. has managed to bring out so much of what makes this text quite interesting, and to render the text in such readable English, is especially noteworthy.

K. does particularly well at situating the text in its many contexts, which has the advantage of making the book useful and appealing to several kinds of scholars. K. does an excellent job of showing how Books V and VI fit, and fail to fit, within the *Politics* as a whole, and indeed within Aristotle's thought generally. It is especially welcome to find much of the assumed moral psychology behind *Politics* V and VI illuminated via the *Nicomachean Ethics* and *Rhetoric*, and to find Aristotle's account of political change set within his larger philosophical account of change in general.

K. also sets the work in its larger ancient context, both philosophical and historical. The many parallels noted throughout between *Politics* V and VI and Plato's *Laws*, for instance, will be of great interest to students of both works. Furthermore, *Politics* V and VI are especially full of historical cases, and K. skillfully discusses these cases and their support (or lack thereof) for the philosophical point at hand. K. is also careful to amplify Aristotle's many references to Greek culture, and to discuss the difficulties involved in rendering Aristotle's Greek.

Philosophers in particular will appreciate K.'s close attention to the details of Aristotle's arguments. K. thoughtfully brings out the structure and presuppositions of the arguments, their difficulties, and the significance of those difficulties. At the same time, K. consistently avoids nitpicking, and where possible offers sensible alternatives for understanding the argument at hand.

Still, one does not derive from the commentary a sufficiently clear sense of Aristotle's project in this text as a whole, and further reflection in this direction would have been illuminating. For instance, Aristotle's task in *Politics* V and VI, and his approach to that task, seems to have been quite innovative. For, as K. notes (pp. 186f.), Aristotle's criticism (5.12, 1316a1 seqq.) of Plato's account of constitutional change (*Republic* 8–9) as unrealistic is odd, both because it departs from Aristotle's usual practice of discussing his predecessors at the beginning of a treatise, not at the end, and especially because the gap in historicity and systematicity between Aristotle's approach and Plato's seems due not to Plato's failure to do what Aristotle does better, but to the fact that Plato's intent in *Republic* VIII and IX is not to give a historical and systematic account of political change in the first place. Perhaps, then, in the project of *Politics* V and VI Aristotle is without a genuine predecessor; and if so, the treatise of *Politics* V and VI gains special importance as the first systematic and empirical treatise on its topic. At any rate, more reflection on the oddity of Aristotle's criticism of Plato is in order, if we are to understand Aristotle's project in *Politics* V and VI as a whole; but such reflection is not found in K.

It would also be worth noting just how breathtaking the principle is from which the project of *Politics* V and VI takes its start: the variety we find among currently existing types of constitutions is based on a *mistake*, in particular, a mistake about the grounds of equality (5.1, 1301a25–b3). While K. does question Aristotle's consistency in maintaining this thesis, and the conception of equality that underlies it, the surprise and even shock that this view is sure to generate in us goes without comment. That is unfortunate in particular because of this issue's bearing on the relevance and accessibility of this text to a modern audience.

There can be no denying, however, that K. has produced a learned and interesting commentary on an important and difficult text. Like the other commentaries in the Clarendon series, it repays careful reading by philosophers and classicists alike.

University of Arizona DANIEL C. RUSSELL

G. Dahan, I. Rosier-Catach (edd.): *La Rhétorique d'Aristote, traditions et commentaires de l'antiquité au xvii^e siècle*. Pp. 356. Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1998. Paper, frs. 250. ISBN: 2-7116-1307-0.

This publication of proceedings of a conference held at Baume-lès-Aix in July 1995 attempts to fill gaps in our understanding of the circulation, translation, transmission, reception,

interpretation, uses, and scholarly and cultural contexts of Aristotle's *Rhetoric.* Some of these topics are discussed indirectly. Lucia Calboli Montefusco deals with technical aspects of rhetoric, *pisteis atechnoi*, but also shows that Aristotle's *Rhetoric* was available to Cicero and Quintilian (pp. 13–35). Luigi Spina examines the relationship between the grammarians and the *Rhetoric*, and shows the acquaintance of ancient scholars with this treatise (pp. 37–48). After the decline of Rome, however, Aristotle's work was temporarily lost to the West.

Some of the more interesting discussions concern the contributions of Arab and Jewish scholars to scholarship on the *Rhetoric*. It was available to the Arabs in their own language in the tenth century, before the first Latin translations appeared. Maroun Aouad (pp. 169–225) and Charles Butterworth (pp. 227–40) suggest that the *Rhetoric* found interest mainly among Arabic philosophers of the school of Hellenistic philosophy known as the *Falsafa*. Although this interest may seem strange on account of the very different social and cultural institutions, the text's popularity was due partly to Arabic philosophers' ignorance of Latin rhetorical treatises. In contrast, however, Pierre Larcher argues that the text had little influence on the *hataba*, the more Islamic rhetorical tradition (pp. 241–56). The reception of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* in Hebraic literature occurred *c.* 1200 via the Arabic philosophers but, as Jean-Pierre Rothschild observes (pp. 257–82), it never completely became part of the Hebraic system of learning and scholarship.

Aristotle's *Rhetoric* was also studied in Byzantium *c.* 1200, as shown by the two commentaries associated with John Italos, which Thomas M. Conley (pp. 49–65) attributes to the support of two royal patronesses, Maria Doukas and Anna Komnenos. In the Latin West Aristotle's *Rhetoric* became known via the Arabs, being studied from *c.* 1240; as Gilbert Dahan (pp. 66–86) points out, new translations and several important commentaries and treatises were produced. Scholarly interest in the *Rhetoric* continued in the west through the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and is reflected in several contributions to this collection. Costantino Marmo (pp. 111–34) considers how Aegidius Romanus used the medieval Latin translations in his commentary on the *Rhetoric*, while Irene Rosier-Catach (pp. 87–110) detects two distinct scholastic movements represented by the *De Scientiis* of the Arabic philosopher al-Farabi (d. 950) and by Roger Bacon (*c.* 1214–94) in 1260 and 1268, respectively, in the assimilation of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* by the Latin West. Joël Biard (pp. 135–52) considers the relationship between rhetoric and the systems of dialectic and moral science in the *Questiones in Rhetoricam Aristotelis* of Jean Buridan (d. *c.* 1358), while Evencio Beltran (pp. 153–67) examines the rhetorical thought behind John of Jandun's (*c.* 1285–1328) *Questiones Super Tres Libros Rethoricorum Aristoteles*.

Renaissance scholars attempted to accommodate the *Rhetoric* within their expectations of other dominant rhetorical works such as the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, Cicero's *De Inventione*, and Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria.* Peter Mack (pp. 299–313) explains that fragments of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* were occasionally cited (sometimes critically) by Renaissance humanists such as Rudolph Agricola (1443–85), Erasmus (*c.* 1466–1536), Melanchthon (1497–1560), and Peter Ramus (1515–72) in their teaching of rhetoric and dialectic to establish their credentials as scholars, to bring authority to their viewpoints, and to establish a basis from which to present original material. Lawrence Green (pp. 28–97) observes that the general interest in the soul during the Renaissance pervaded and influenced aspects of translation and commentary on Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, as evidenced in the analyses by some scholars of the *Rhetoric* in terms of contemporary conceptions of the soul. As Kees Meerhoff notes (pp. 315–30), Aristotle's *Rhetoric* also featured in discussions about the relationship between rhetoric, ethics, and politics, although it was rarely fully exploited by Renaissance scholars. François Douay-Soublin observes (pp. 331–46) that the *Rhetoric* was an important text in Jesuit circles between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries, although it should be observed that it did not become widely influential until about the turn of the eighteenth century.

Collectively the sixteen contributions in this volume illustrate that Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, far from being a text that has come down to us unencumbered by the weight of scholarly tradition and comment, assumed an important rôle during the medieval, Renaissance, and neo-classical periods in the Greek, Arabic, Jewish, Byzantine, and Latin traditions. Notwithstanding several inconsistencies in scholarly citation and in typography, this volume represents an important contribution to the history of the reception of Aristotelian rhetoric.

University of Natal WILLIAM J. DOMINIK

D. G. BATTISTI (ed.): *Dionigi di Alicarnasso:* Sull'imitazione. *Edizione critica, traduzione e commento*. Pp. 161. Pisa and Rome: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali, 1997. Paper. ISBN: 88-8147-037-3.

In his letter to Pompeius Geminus, Dionysius gives a short summary of the treatise *On Imitation*, on which he was working at that time: 'The first of these (viz. three books) contains an enquiry into the nature of imitation itself, the second discusses the question of which particular poets and philosophers, historians and orators, should be imitated. The third, dealing with the question of how imitation should be done, is as yet incomplete' (3.1; translation after S. Usher). Imitation ('mimesis') of the old, 'classical' authors is central to Dionysius' classicist conception of literary production, and his many critical essays aim in a very practical sense at showing which authors are worthy of imitation, which qualities in particular should be taken over on the one hand, which mistakes should be avoided on the other. All the more of a pity is it that most of this theoretical treatise on imitation has been lost. The remains—seven fragments of the first two books and an epitome of the second (unfortunately, nothing at all has survived of the third)—have now again been edited and, as it seems for the first time, translated into Italian by Daniela Battisti. The book is an enlarged and revised version of the author's 'tesi di laurea' (p. 7).

In a general introduction (pp. 9–30), B. gives an intelligible outline of Dionysius' conception of mimesis, whose pluralist (eclectic) and creative character is well brought out. However, B. does not discuss Dionysius' position within the classicist movement, and she says hardly anything about the placing (and dating) of the treatise within Dionysius' *oeuvre.* But perhaps the main problem with this chapter is that none of the many contributions to scholarship on Dionysius published after 1991 could be taken into account (not even E. Gabba, *Dionysius and The History of Archaic Rome* [Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 1991]). Given the date of publication, this seems rather surprising.

The text and translation of the fragments and of the epitome form the bulk of the volume (pp. 37–97). Unlike the epitome, the fragments are edited without apparatus criticus and there is a commentary on the epitome only. No explanation is given for this uneven treatment. The numbering of the fragments differs slightly from the one in the Belles Lettres Edition by G. Aujac (Paris 1992), but the text is almost identical. B.'s focus of interest obviously lies on the epitome. She has compared some late manuscripts in addition to those taken into account by Usener (Leipzig 1889) and Aujac. But since all these depend on the Parisinus 1741 not much is gained from this procedure. As an editor, B. takes a more conservative line than Usener and Aujac (whose edition she could not—as it seems—take into close consideration), which does not always improve the readability of the text.

The commentary on the epitome (pp. 99–130) contains some sound observations and many useful references, but, again, suffers from the long interval between its writing and its publication. Thus, B.'s readers will still profit from additionally looking at Aujac's short but stimulating introduction and notes. Irritating, too, is the lack of a general discussion of how the discrepancies between the epitome and the long overlapping extract (F 5 B.; 7 Aujac) from Dionysius' own letter to Pompeius Geminus (on which see S. Fornaro, *Dionisio di Alicarnasso, Epistola a Pompeo Gemino* [Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1997], reviewed by Cynthia Damon in *CR* 48 [1998], 288–9) are to be explained. Here, one misses a reference to K. S. Sacks's suggestion ('Historiography in the Rhetorical Works of Dionysius of Halicarnassus', *Athenaeum* 61 [1983], 65–87) that the passage in the *Letter* is not an extract, but the product of a revision reflecting later changes in Dionysius' attitude towards historiography (but see also M. Heath, 'Dionysius of Halicarnassus "On Imitation" ', *Hermes* 117 [1995], 370–3, who takes Usener's line that the *Letter* reproduced a draft, the epitome the published version of the treatise).

Scholars working on Dionysius will find some useful information and ideas in B.'s book, especially in the commentary. But the main (and not small) merit of this volume can be seen in making an important theoretical treatise (or what remains of it) of Greek classicism easily accessible to an Italian-speaking audience.

University of Berne THOMAS HIDBER

J. LALLOT: *La Grammaire de Denys le Thrace*. Pp. 308. Paris: CNRS Editions, 1998. Paper. ISBN: 2-271-05591-1.

Despite a notable increase of interest and scholarship on Dionysius Thrax in recent years, it is still remarkably difficult to get hold of a text outside libraries, while translations are few and elusive, and commentaries all but non-existent. It is therefore very welcome that Jean Lallot's annotated text and translation have been published in a second, revised and expanded edition.

This is, as befits its all-but-unique place in the market, an edition for all readers. Taking Uhlig's 1883 text, it provides an elegant translation and exhaustive notes. A substantial introduction outlines the manuscript and papyrus traditions of the work, its structure and contents. The ancient and modern controversies about the work's 'authenticity' and attribution—and it is hard to say which is more convoluted—are briefly but helpfully described with reference to the major scholars involved. L. touches on the place of the *Techne* in Hellenistic philosophical tradition, but, properly, discusses much more thoroughly its place in the grammatical tradition, both Hellenistic and Roman.

The notes might more properly be called a very full scholarly commentary. Here L. gives us the benefit of his long consideration of grammatical texts in an immensely wide-ranging, detailed, erudite, and individual exegesis, chapter by chapter. He deals with formal linguistic problems, relationships between Dionysian points and the analysis of other grammarians, literary critical application, and historical context, with even the occasional judicious foray into comparative sociology, as in his discussion of the act of reading. He gives close attention both to ancient commentators and to modern scholars, while frequently, finally, espousing his own interpretation. He appends several thorough and useful indices, and what is probably now the most accessible and up-to-date bibliography available on the topic.

Dionysian scholars have never shrunk from controversy, and most will find things here with which to engage. Those who are coming to the subject for the first time might want more background on the philosophical and literary critical sides than L. provides, though they will be very well furnished on the grammatical side. For both groups, however, this volume is an enormous service, a necessary addition to every bookshelf, and very probably the standard edition and commentary for some time to come.

University College, Oxford TERESA MORGAN

S. JEDRKIEWICZ: *Il convitato sullo sgabello. Plutarco, Esopo ed i Sette Savi.* (Filologia e Critica, 80.) Pp. 171. Pisa and Rome: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali, 1997. Paper. ISBN: 88-8147-102-7.

Plutarch's *Dinner of the Seven Wise Men* (Loeb title) is quite a remarkable work for women and love, as Judith Mossman has demonstrated in a highly original essay, 'Plutarch's *Dinner of the Seven Wise Men* and its Place in *Symposion* Literature', in J. Mossman (ed.), *Plutarch and his Intellectual World* (London, 1997), pp. 119–40. At first we seem to be at Trimalchio's dinner, but before long, Plutarch has managed to express many of his own deepest views on friendship, hospitality, love, divine retribution, and—through the dolphin stories—providence's care for the devout.

J. divides his space between Plutarch's dialogue itself and Aesop. (His previous book was *Sapere e paradosso nell'Antichità. Esopo e la favola* [Rome, 1989]). J. is honest about this, but Aesop figures only in about 5% of Plutarch's text even if more important than that. J. skips discussion of the work's authenticity, sufficiently defended by modern scholars against charges of incoherence and the like. He in fact reveals the complex internal dynamic motivating the personae and the very creative twists and turns Plutarch has devised to move the story forward. He concludes that the 'Seven Sages' is not only worthy of a savant like Plutarch but also harmonizes with the political, cultural, and religious convictions expressed elsewhere in his large *corpus.*

For J., Aesop is an iconoclastic sage and fable-spinner, remarkable for his wit and intellectual vivacity. His sagacity stands out against the more dignified, 'traditional' wisdom of the Sages as depicted in archaic literature. Nonetheless, he considers it paradoxical that Plutarch in a symposiac setting should pit Aesop against the Seven Sages (esp. pp. 85–94). The paradox leads him to analyse the dialogue in some depth, particularly the genres. This is a valuable

contribution. First, he tags the dialogue as *spoudaiogeloion* (Chapter I). The peculiar 'tools' of Aesop's wisdom trade are analysed as gnome, enigma, imagistic comparisons, and the like (Chapter II). He then turns to the characters (Chapter III), Aesop's relationship to the others (Chapter IV), and finally 'to the Aesopic genre' found elsewhere in Plutarch (Chapter V). Regarding the initial question he put to himself, J. comes up with a novel theory. He argues that Plutarch recognized the potential in the older type of oral wisdom, constructed and expressed through maxims, enigmas, fables, and myths. Such sapiential devices were perfectly acceptable in the archaic period. However, as they came to be considered naïve, they were replaced with the more demanding, scholarly type of philosophical discourse, represented often by Plutarch's own writing. Once he decided to introduce the archaic 'gnoseological tools' for the Seven Sages, Plutarch had to overcome a long-standing prejudice against them. The solution was to introduce the ambivalent Aesop, known for sagacity and enjoying equality with the Seven Sages, but born a slave. Though a personal friend, he is quick to prick the weak points in their arguments. So, Aesop is an invited guest and present throughout the banquet, but also something of a pariah. Significantly, he remains seated on a 'stool' (the *sgabello* of the title).

Aesop's non-conformity allows the liberty of action denied to the others. From his eccentric position, he can introduce his own 'small change' wisdom, characterized by earthy content, oral creativity, and 'ludic' interplay. His alternative sagacity puts in jeopardy the official wisdom of the venerable Seven. Plutarch thus casts a shadow of doubt on accepted wisdom. He does not want to destroy, though, but to integrate. He suggests that the finest achievements of the human mind may lack a universal dimension, and that the most profound and eternal quests for truth may escape us, that ultimately we run up against the barrier of the ambiguity and inexplicability embedded in the nature of reality.

Regarding a few textual points: at 147C11, 'to harvest *αἴρας* (darnel) and *ὀνώιδας* (rest-harrow)' (for *ἀκρίδας* [grasshoppers] and *ὄρνιθας* [birds)] 'instead of wheat and barley'—accepted on p. 49—and like corrections are unnecessary. At 152D1, he is right to accept Reiske's reading (*τῆς δὲ θεοῦ φωνῆς*), not in opposition to the controversial conjecture of Babbitt (*τῆς δ' ἴσου φωνῆς*) ('the voice of equality before the law')—reported anonymously on p. 88 n. 24—but in opposition to the MSS.

The *sgabello* of J.'s title also betrays the ambiguity of ultimate reality and the futility of self-assured wisdom. Aesop, in the dialogue (150A), sits on a low (*χαμαίζηλος*) *diphros* (in *LSJ*, 'seat, couch, stool', 'judge's seat of office', 'royal throne'). *Sgabello* ('footstool', 'small seat without back or arms') on p. 83 becomes the more Aesopic '*Un certo sgabellino molto basso*'.

Pontifical Biblical Institute, Rome FREDERICK E. BRENK

Università di Palermo FERDINANDO LO CASCIO

M. R. Cammarota: *Plutarco: La fortuna o La virtu di Alessandro Magno*. Pp. 297. Naples: M. D'Auria Editore, 1998. Paper. ISBN: 88-7092-148-4.

Except for J. R. Hamilton, who devoted some pages to Plutarch's *De Alexandri Magni fortuna aut virtute* in his commentary on Plutarch's *Alexander* (Oxford, 1969), pp. xxiii–xxxiii, Anglo-American scholars have given little attention to the two 'epideictic display pieces' which comprise this unusual rhetorical exercise. R. H. Barrow, *Plutarch and his Times* (London, 1967), and C. P. Jones, *Plutarch and Rome* (Oxford, 1971), gave incidental attention to *De fortuna Alexandri*, as did ancient historians such as E. Badian, A. B. Bosworth, and N. C. L. Hammond, but until Cammarota's study, it was German scholars, especially W. Nachstädt, who contributed most to understanding this probably youthful work. But Nachstädt's dissertation and article of 1894 and 1895, respectively, have clearly been superseded (see K. Ziegler, *Plutarchos von Chaironeia* [Stuttgart, 1964], coll. 85–7).

C.'s critical edition, no. 30 in the *Corpus Plutarchi Moralium*, edd. P. Consenza, I. Gallo, I. Torraca, is a very welcome addition to understanding Plutarch's *De fortuna Alexandri.* There is a good introduction to its literary form, structure, and content; and a text and translation follow with a detailed 'commento'. C. has a fine command of the secondary literature, and also demonstrates a thorough knowledge of the manuscript tradition (pp. 64–92).

C. knows well that *De fortuna Alexandri* cannot be understood in isolation from *De fortuna Romanorum* and *De gloria Atheniensum*, and so tries to emphasize the 'coerenza interna

dell'opera plutarchea e sottolineare come nello opere giovanili si trovino espressi tutti i concetti che Plutarco svilupperá nelle *Vite parallele*' (p. 25). There is, however, no full discussion of the various senses of (*tyche*) and (*arete*) which play such a great rôle both in Plutarch's youthful and later works. Yet C. provides a most interesting discussion of 'true rhetoric' and 'sophistic rhetoric' (pp. 33–42) in Plutarch's thought. The relationship between Plutarch's youthful works on Alexander and fortune also invite other questions about this early rhetorical work and the life of *Alexander*, questions to which C. devotes attention on pp. 44–55, drawing sometimes on the judgements of Badian and Hamilton. This otherwise quite attractive study of *De fortuna Alexandri* lacks an index of topics and concepts/words discussed. The *index nominum* and the *index auctorum a Plutarcho laudatorum* are fine, but seem insufficient. The lack of an additional index is unfortunate since the commentary is quite detailed. The Italian translation is generally an accurate rendering of the Greek, and not overly literal. In sum, this is a work which can be commended to students of Plutarch and of Alexander the Great.

University of Minnesota, Minneapolis JACKSON P. HERSHBELL

P. PAYEN: *Plutarque: Grecs et Romains en question*s (Entretiens d'archéologie et d'histoire. Saint-Bertrand-de-Comminges, Musée archéologique départmental). Pp. 184, ills, maps. Toulouse: Haute-Garonne Conseil General, 1998. Cased, frs. 160. ISBN: 2-912729-00-9.

The aim of this collection is to do justice to Plutarch's *Questiones Romanae* and *Questiones Graecae*. In the Introduction Pascal Payen promises 'approches croisées des historiens et des philologues' who will discuss 'le sens et la construction' of the works, their history, and the reasons for their 'oubli'. The latter topic features prominently since three (Claudine Leduc, Jean-Marc Luce, François Hartog) of the seven contributors do not mention the *QR*, the *QGr*, or indeed refer much to Plutarch. Of the others, none is particularly memorable. Catherine Darbo-Peschanski explores questions of genre and disparity between the works, and advances an original idea that Plutarch's yen for parallels reflects his Middle Platonist dualism. Jacques Boulogne sees the *Questions* as looking for signs in the divine scheme which lead readers from alterity to identity and the creation of 'l'homme gréco-romain': see my review in *Ploutarchos* 12.2 (1996), 16–20. P.'s chapter starts with a plea to read both *Questions* as one seamless narrative from Roman to Greek. That there is no evidence they were one work and that P.'s own chapter shows clearly the vast differences between the types of questions and answers they contain is apparently no deterrent for P., who repeatedly confesses admiration for Lévi-Strauss. Jean-Marie Pailler offers the best account of the *Questions*, looking at the relationship between early Roman *Lives* and the *QR*. However, his proposed typology (p. 82) will prove too difficult for most readers: 'Question brève, Question large; Question résolue, Question laissée ouverte; Question simple, Question complexe . . .'.

P. announces in the Introduction that the next *Entretiens* will address a question 'non tranchée dans les recherches actuelles': was Plutarch's Hellenism more than a museum piece? Let us hope the contributors have discovered the welter of modern literature on the material and ideological aspects of the Greek world under Rome.

University of Warwick SIMON SWAIN

É. FAMERIE: *Le Latin et le Grec d'Appien. Contribution à l'étude du lexique d'un historien grec de Rome*. Pp. xviii + 459. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 1998. Paper. ISBN: 2-600-00273-1.

Famerie has written an important contribution to the study of Appian and literary Greek under the High Roman Empire. After an up-to-date survey of Appian's life and work (including a cautious discussion of the Eutychia epigram), the book divides into two. The first part examines how Appian translated Latin technical terms. F. also considers Latinisms in Appian's

Greek. Part 2 addresses neologisms in Appian's Greek. There are detailed bibliographies and indexes.

How did Greek authors cope with Roman technical terms? Two studies stand out: Magie's *De Romanorum iuris publici sacrique vocabulis sollemnibus in Graecum sermonem conversis* (Leipzig, 1905) and Mason's *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions. A Lexicon and Analysis* (Toronto, 1974). Magie filed Greek renderings under the three typologies of equivalence, translation, and transcription. F. (pp. 52ff.) points out the serious weaknesses of this system, specifically Magie's obliviousness to the sources or chronology of his evidence, and tries his best to criticize Mason (who at least starts from Greek rather than Latin). F. reasonably claims that the present state of knowledge of Greek under Rome calls for detailed studies of single authors (p. 56). The study of Appian's translations of Latin terms in Chapter II of Part 1 contains much of value (see e.g. on ἀνθύπατος and ἀντιστράτηγος at pp. 68–86, and note the list of terms at pp. 204–7). It is plain that Appian often preferred 'descriptive' translations; that these are principally of Republican words does not help prove that he was writing for Greeks. In Chapter III F. looks at Latinisms. He is not interested in syntax, contenting himself with naming the usual suspects (use of the dative, growing importance of prepositions, rôle of the secondary tenses). He scores good points against the exaggerated claims of Latinisms in Hering's *Lateinisches bei Appian* (Leipzig, 1935). In fact, 'la moisson est bien maigre' (p. 218). There is only one spectacular example: ἐξοπλίζω, which in Appian means 'disarm' rather than 'arm completely' (cf. already Polybius' ἔξοπλος).

The second part is an enquiry into Appian's rôle in 'le mouvement général de la κουνή littéraire d'époque impériale' (p. 243). F. looks at new Greek formations and new meanings of existing words. Students of Greek will certainly find material for thought here, as will Roman historians (pp. 318–23 on what Appian means by δυσανδρία in second-century Italy). At pp. 368–82 F. compares Appian with Polybius, Ptolemaic, and post-Ptolemaic papyri. The result is clear: 'la volunté . . . d'exploiter le vocabulaire classique en évitant de recourir à des termes nouveaux' (p. 371). Most neologisms in fact 'aient trait à la vie militaire' (p. 380). In his desire to conform to 'une langue éprouvée, voire ancienne' he shows 'traits archaïsants et artificiels' (p. 381), esp. the dual (a 'conception extrême de l'atticisme', to which F. devotes an appendix) and the frequent use of ἀμφί. Yet he 'n'appartient pas au mouvement atticiste' (ibid.). This is confused. F. brings out clearly that Appian *was* strongly affected by the linguistic purism of educated Greek in his time (add a predilection for the optative). The syntactical features ascribed to Latin influence (see above) are widespread in later Greek authors—though in Appian's case mixing with Latin is certainly possible. But the claim to purism was more important than the reality. Moreover, Atticizing Greek shaded into the educated *koine*: to speak of the 'heterogeneity' of Appian's Greek (pp. 244, 381)—i.e. *koine* and classicizing—is wrong. This has implications for his main audience. Someone who lived in Rome no doubt wanted to be read by Romans. Given his career as a barrister in the City, Appian could have written in Latin. He chose Greek, and Greek with a clear message.

University of Warwick SIMON SWAIN

E. Bianco (tr.): *Gli stratagemmi di Polieno*. Pp. 293. Turin: Edizioni dell'Orso, 1997. Paper, L. 30,000. ISBN: 88-7694-309-9.

Polyaenus' stratagem collection—despite its many flaws—remains an indispensable source for Greek history, as it both preserves otherwise lost fragments of historians and often contains alternative accounts to the 'orthodox' views of other writers. Thus Italian students of Greek history, especially those with little or no Greek, should welcome Elisabetta Bianco's translation—the first in modern Italian—with a thorough (if brief) introduction, critical notes, and indices of both personal names and geographical and ethnic names.

If the merit of B.'s work for Italian readers is evident, anglophone scholars will ask: what does this Italian translation offer that the recent Krentz–Wheeler translation (P. Krentz, E. L. Wheeler, *Polyaenus, Stratagems of War* [Chicago, 1994], 2 vols.: hereafter 'K.–W.') does not? K.–W. includes the Greek texts and English translations of both Polyaenus and two Byzantine adaptations of Polyaenus, the *Excerpta Polyaeni* and the *Strategemata of Leo* from the *Sylloge Tacticorum.* B. does not print a Greek text and erroneously claims (p. 13 with n. 34) that K.–W. merely reprints Melber's 1887 Teubner, thus ignoring K.–W.'s list (pp. xxxi–xxxiii) of corrections and emendations to Melber. B.'s introduction (pp. 5–14) coincides extensively (mostly without acknowledgement) with Wheeler's views (K.–W., pp. vi–xxx), although some new work (since

1993) is included in the bibliography, to which D. Gera, *Warrior Women: The Anonymous* Tractatus de Mulieribus (Leiden, 1997)—reviewed in this number, pp. 352–3—should now be added.

The real merit of B.'s work lies in the notes, although her target audience is unclear. Historians will find many notes trite or repetitious of the known, often giving a thumbnail sketch of an individual without enlightenment on the specific situation of the stratagem being annotated. Those familiar with the scholarship on Polyaenus will find little or no progress in identification of many obscure rusé figures, and references to secondary literature are omitted. Errors also occur: e.g. the Iranian Sacae of 7.11.6 (cf. 7.12) are not a Thracian people (p. 214 nn. 27, 29), and B. does not realize that the Autariatae (7.13) are an Illyrian tribe (p. 232 n.70; cf. Strabo 7.5.1, 6, 11, 12; 7 fr. 4). Nor will all agree with B.'s identification of doublets (e.g. 3.9.41, 46, 50; 3.11.9–10, 12). Nevertheless, B.'s extensive lists of parallel sources for individual exempla exceed those in Melber's Teubner, and new dates for many anecdotes of Iphicrates are proposed—no doubt reflecting B.'s recent study ('Ificrate, ῥήτωρ καὶ στρατηγός', *MGR* 21 [1997], 179–207). B.'s lists of parallels thus offer a handy reference resource without replacing Melber's exhaustive discussion (*Jahrb. f. cl. Phil.*, Suppl. 14 [1885], 417–688). B.'s promises (pp. 13–14) to re-evaluate Polyaenus' use of sources and to establish him as a real military theorist are not fulfilled, and would require detailed discussion in a format other than short notes to the exempla.

As a translation, the work is accurate, with occasional (and insignificant) differences on interpretation of phrases from K.–W. The Italian is readable for non-natives, although B.'s periphrastic (e.g. 5.12.2) 'riuscì a vincerlo ricorrendo a uno stratagemma' for κατεστρατήγησεν does not seem to grasp the simplicity of English 'out-general' for this verb. Certain liberties with the text can also be cited. B. does not include the 'tables of contents' preceding each of the eight books, but adds (without explanation) chapter titles from the 'table of contents' to the text of the very fragmentary Book 6 (6.26, 28–35, 37, 39–40, 42–4). Exempla from the *Excerpta* are also inserted as if genuine: Melber accepted *Excerpta* 11.2 as Polyaen. 5.48 (cf. also 6.27, 36, 38, 41), but B. adds (without justification) *Excerpta* 26.2 as Polyaen. 3.12.2—a sharp departure from Melber, who only noted it in his apparatus. B. also disregards various Polyaenian peculiarities: Thrasyllus with one lambda (1.47), Attilus with one tau (8.12), and the careful distinction of Lacedaemonians, Spartiates, Laconians, and Λάκωναι; for B. all are 'Spartiani'.

Despite these criticisms, B.'s *Polieno* will be a useful reference tool for anglophone Greek historians and a boon for Italian students.

Duke University EVERETT L. WHEELER

D. O'Meara: *Plotin: Traité 51, Introduction, traduction, commentaire et notes*. Pp. 191. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1999. Paper, frs. 145. ISBN: 2-204-05956-0.

Plotinus' treatise on the nature and origin of evils, which in Porphyry's thematic arrangement is the eighth treatise of the first Ennead, was among the last that he wrote. In it he argues for the identification of absolute evil with matter; other evils, such as the nature of body and vice in the soul, are secondary and derivative.

Dominic O'Meara's translation and commentary is the fifth to appear in a series, under the general editorship of Pierre Hadot, which will become standard for all who refer to Plotinus' works. In it Plotinus' works are referred to by their chronological order of composition rather than by Porphyry's thematic arrangement. Recent research on Plotinus makes new commentaries all the more necessary; and the continued growth of interest in the philosophy of later antiquity, in which Plotinus played an important if in some ways idiosyncratic part, will ensure that the series is consulted by a wide range of readers. O'M. presents Plotinus' argument in a clearly articulated form, introducing sub-headings, identifying sequences of objections and responses, and making clear the contribution of each part to the whole. Plotinus' discussion consequently appears more structured than in some other versions; and indeed, while Porphyry says that Plotinus' poor eyesight prevented him re-reading what he had written (*Life of Plotinus*, 8), he also says that Plotinus worked out his whole argument in his mind before he started writing.

O'M. lists twenty-three places where his translation presupposes a reading different from that found in either the *editio major* or the *editio minor* of Henry and Schwyzer. In many cases, however, it is a matter of following one of these rather than the other. There are only four places where O'M. adopts a reading not accepted by Henry and Schwyzer anywhere at all (including the

addenda in the third volume of each of their editions). At 5.12 O'M. proposes reading, for τὸ μὴ ἀγαθὸν εἶναι, either τὸ μὴ τἀγαθὸν εἶναι or τὸ ἀγαθὸν μὴ εἶναι, in order to remove the implication that deficiency involves not being good at all. At 6.53–4 he follows Igal in deleting the first ἐναντίον and transposing καὶ ἐνταῦθα to follow the second. He transposes 8.16–18 to follow 8.12, improving the sequence of the argument and explaining the error through homoioteleuton; and at 15.26 he proposes <παρ>οῦσα, on the basis of parallels in Chapter XIV. Other, more tentative suggestions are made in the notes (e.g. to delete τὴν κακίαν—ἅπασιν at 5.31–2 as a gloss) and suggestions by others for the text or for its interpretation are rightly rejected (e.g. τὸ <μὴ> κατ' οὐσίαν at 6.46 from Henry and Schwyzer's addenda). The complications of 14.39–40 are convincingly resolved.

At 3.8 O'M.'s translation ('comme autour de l'être') seems to presuppose ὡς περὶ τὸ ὄν, rather than ἢ περὶ τὸ ὄν. At 5.32–3 the repetition of κρατεῖν is not reproduced in the translation. In the translation of 11.4 'ainsi *il* n'existera pas' would have removed a potential ambiguity in the French which is not present in the Greek.

Plotinus is not a dualist; matter is the last stage in the process of emanation from the One, and is always illuminated by the intelligible (D. O'Brien, cited by O.'M. p. 164 in the context of the striking image of the prisoners hidden by chains of gold with which the treatise ends). Plotinus' identification of matter as absolute evil was nevertheless attacked by Proclus, for whom, as O'M. explains (p. 40), evils were privations and there is no real and absolute evil. O'M., who discusses Proclus' criticisms of the present treatise at length (pp. 30–6, cf. pp. 132–3), agrees that Plotinus cannot consistently maintain both the identification of matter with absolute evil and the doctrine of emanation (pp. 34–5). Plotinus is, however, more true to Plato than is Proclus in his readings both of *Theaetetus* 176a (pp. 96–7) and of the *Timaeus* (pp. 130–1). As for the source of evil in the soul, O'M. notes O'Brien's view that matter is a necessary but not a sufficient cause, but remarks that the present treatise puts particular emphasis on the rôle of matter, in accordance with its aim of establishing it as primary evil: 'treatise 51 cannot therefore be considered a comprehensive and balanced study of all aspects of evil' (pp. 38–9).

University College London R. W. SHARPLES

R. Bargheer: *Die Gottesvorstellung Heliodors in den Aithopika*. Pp. 187. Frankfurt am Main, etc.: Peter Lang, 1999. Paper, £35. ISBN: 3-631-33836-8.

The number of publications devoted to the Greek novel, and in particular to Longus and Heliodorus, seems to grow daily. Even so, some important areas of discussion remain relatively uncharted, particularly in the area of the relationships between these texts and the cultural and conceptual frameworks of their contemporary societies. Rosemarie Bargheer's book (her *Promotion*) attempts to site Heliodorus' presentation of divinity within the context of the pagan theology that prevailed under Julian. This is a promising recipe; but the dish, it must be said, is somewhat undercooked.

B. argues that the narrative of the *Aethiopica* reflects a 'göttliche Plan', a preordained path along which the protagonists are guided by 'lenkende Mächte'. Of these various powers, the most important is Helios/Apollo, who, along with Artemis/Selene/Isis, assumes the central position in Heliodorus' divine system. (She also considers lesser divinities—*tyche*, *moira*, and so forth—but it is unclear what is to be gained by considering such Wgures as deities, rather than abstractions or narratological markers.) This focus upon the central, choregic rôle of the sun-god reflects, according to B., the centrality of Helios to late antique polytheism, and in particular to Julian's thought.

To a certain extent, B. is surely right: if one does accept the argument for a late fourth-century dating (as most do, though not all), then Heliodorus' reorientation away from Zeus as the centre of the pantheon towards Apollo/Helios does demand interpretation in the light of Neoplatonism and neopaganism. But the nature of the relationship between the two is not self-evident, and requires a rather more nuanced approach than that adopted here. The *Aethiopica* is not simply religious 'propaganda' (p. 173; back cover): the genre of the novel (famously disapproved of by Julian himself: *Epist.* 89b Bidez 301b) would surely not have been the first choice for a propagandist. What about the roles of irony, humour, and deception in Heliodorus' presentation of religion? B. is insensitive to the different tones and registers in which the various speakers articulate their thoughts on the divine. Comparison with the practices of the other novelists

would have helped in this respect, but this is entirely lacking, with the result that there is little awareness here of the sense of the ludic in the genre as a whole.

The argumentation is rather superficial. Chapter I is a prolix summary of the debates over dating; Chapters II and III, in which B. traces the rôle of divine machinery, contain a good deal of unnecessary summarizing of the plot. Chapter IV discusses each Heliodorean god, considering each in turn 'in der antike Religion' and then 'bei Heliodor'. This background/foreground schema is not particularly helpful: the rôle of a deity in ancient religion as a whole cannot be summarized meaningfully in a few pages. Moreover, it is at times difficult to see what is the relevance of the 'background' material to the 'foreground': how, for example, does the discussion of the sun cult in Egypt from the third millennium B.C.E. (pp. 94–6) bear upon a Greek text composed in the fourth century C.E.? A concluding chapter summarizes the currents of thought in late antique paganism and Neoplatonism, but without explaining precisely how the *Aethiopica* uses these resources.

An important issue, then, but treated with too little depth or sensitivity. Religion is indeed a crucial point of intersection between the novels and the wider cultural world for which they were written, but the topic demands a more nuanced account of the relationship between a sophisticated literary text and its manifold contexts both past and present.

St John's College, Cambridge TIM WHITMARSH

G. ZANETTO: *Terenzio:* Eunuco. Pp. 190. Milan: Biblioteca Universale Rizzoli, 1999. Paper, L. 13,000. ISBN: 88-17-17263-4.

Professor Zanetto, who has already edited the *Phormio* (1991) and *Andria* (1998) for the present series, now completes the six plays of Terence with the *Eunuchus*. Latin text and Italian translation stand on facing pages, with notes at the foot of the page. The Latin text is substantially that of Marouzeau (variations therefrom are listed on pp. 32–3). A useful bibliography gives a representative selection of works by Italian, French, German, English, and American scholars; a significant number of the entries date from 1980. The notes, occupying about two-thirds as much space as the Latin text, do not offer a continuous commentary on the play, but focus, often in some detail, on the main points of plot construction and interpretation of character; see, for instance, the long note (n. 138) on the much discussed final scene of the play. Italian readers are fortunate to have at so modest a price a well printed and sensible edition of what was for the Roman audience Terence's most popular play.

University of Leeds R. H. MARTIN

R. JORDAN (ed.): *Virgil:* Aeneid *II*. Pp. xvi + 105, ills. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 1999. Paper, £8.95. ISBN: 1-85399-542-8.

This replaces the Gould and Whiteley edition (originally Macmillan, 1943) in the Bristol Classical Press series for schools. Although 'Vergil' has become 'Virgil' and third declension accusative plurals in *-is* are now printed *-es* (a helpful change for GCSE students), the identical cover design and the same pictures give a first, but misleading, impression that little has changed. In fact two extra pictures (a page of manuscript, with 567–88 added in, and a fragment of papyrus) make an interesting addition, but neither is discussed beyond its brief caption. The pages now have smaller borders but, although the vocabulary is printed in a larger size, the actual text is smaller than in the G.–W. version. In the vocabulary naturally long vowels are marked by a macron, but not if they are followed by two or more consonants. The separate list of proper names works well. The student must consult the notes as well as the vocabulary for the most appropriate lexical help: e.g. 'mentior' is given in the vocabulary as 'lie, deceive' but the 'falsely say' required in 540 occurs in the notes. There are relatively few differences from G.–W., but note for instance 'labes' in 97 where their 'taint' has become 'slip' ('strike, blow' in the vocabulary), the more common interpretation. One apparent slip: 'quater' is given as 'three times'. On another level, did Polites, fleeing for his life, 'roam' rather than simply 'cross' the 'vacua atria' in 528? Much is packed into the eight pages of introduction, summarizing the *Aeneid* itself and dealing suggestively with Virgil's life and the relationships between the poet and his predecessors, and the poem and Rome. These sections are written with great economy

and inevitably make many assumptions, but offer much to students coming to Virgil for the first time. Likewise the appendices on scansion give helpful explanation and improve on G.–W.; the fifth foot spondee in 68 is well discussed, but overall disappointingly little is said in the notes about Virgil's rhythms.

It is the usefulness or otherwise of the notes which will most determine the popularity of the edition with teachers and pupils. BCP has not taken advantage of a new edition to arrange the notes facing the text: they remain 'at the back', where the pupils for whom they mainly seem designed will find them harder to use. There is plenty of help with grammar, and J. frequently renders in fluent English those phrases which are awkward literally. As with other parts of the book, the notes have a concise and condensed feel to them, and J. must have agonized over what to include and what not. Forms such as the third plural perfect in *-ere* are explained every time they occur (useful for those reading only short selections), but not much enlightenment is afforded by references such as to 'the so called ethic dative' (146). Terms such as 'chiasmus' (28) and 'subjective genitive' (44) are not explained. The range of J.'s notes might be illustrated by 27: J. draws attention to the grand tone, supported by alliteration, explains some grammar with the help of a translation, and suggests a modern parallel, all in less than three lines. Translation is, however, paramount, and there is comparatively little linking of the text to Virgil's Rome; no discussion, for instance, of the Penates at 293, and no speculation that Romans might think of the 'sidus Iulium' when reading about the shooting star omen in 694. J. often succeeds in being more helpful than G.–W. and simultaneously more succinct: his simple treatment of the snakes' immense backs in 208 is welcome after the heavy weather made of this by G.–W. J.'s concern to do more to stimulate critical appreciation can be seen in his comments on the introduction to Laocoon's speech at 40, but although he offers much more literary comment than G.–W., a glance through the notes for the similes, or for scenes such as the snakes or the death of Priam, shows how much has not been noted.

Despite these criticisms, the book is to be commended: in a very limited space allocation J. has done much to aid the student through difficulties. Much is inevitably left to the teacher, but perhaps we should be grateful that we can choose where and what to pursue further. Finally, this reviewer warmly applauds J.'s dedication to Michael Booker, to whose infectious love of Latin he too owes much.

Oundle PETER BARKER

ALIE BIJKER: *Riedel Horatiana. A Catalogue of the Horace Collection in Groningen University Library*. Pp. xx + 299, 26 pls. Nieuwkoop: De Graaf, 1996. ISBN: 90-6004-435-5.

Riedel Horatiana catalogues the collection presented to the University of Groningen following the death of the collector Hendrik Riedel in 1871. At something over 1,100 volumes, this is one of the largest such collections in existence. Some comparisons may be odious but useful. The British Library has 1,670 separate editions of Horace (not counting works on Horace) in its pre-1975 printed catalogue, thirty-two of them incunabula, about 150 from the sixteenth century. Here there are seven incunabula (six of them in the BL, and catalogued in *A Catalogue of Books Printed in the Fifteenth Century Now in the British Museum* [London, 1908–85, 11 vols], though that greatest of catalogues is mentioned only once here), and about eighty-five sixteenth-century books. Taking as a sample the last entry on each of the first twenty-two text pages, I find that ten out of the twenty-two are not in the British Library. The same random selection uncovered the following small inaccuracies:

Inc 7, *Ars poetica*, dated 14XX: this is not Hain *8919, a book known in a single copy at BSB Munich, but *8918, part VII of a complete works issued by Martin Landsberg at Leipzig in 1492 (the colophon date of part V, *Epodes*). But an accurate description of this pamphlet, 'missing since 1986', was perhaps not to be expected.

A-12. Printed, as the book itself says, by Pierre Gaudoul, information omitted here. Ioannes Parvus (Jean Petit) was only a publisher. Gaudoul, quite a big printer in the 1520s, thus fails to appear in the index of Printers and Publishers.

A-43. The title has *poematum*, here misprinted *poematorum*.

It is good to have the expert collations supplied for the pre-1801 books, but only for single-volume editions. As stated on p. xv, books issued in two or more parts have no collations, but it is not at all clear why the 'Dutch guidelines for describing rare books' should discriminate in

this way. Some editions are further favoured with a 'fingerprint', a device supposedly securing identification of the edition by samplings at arbitrarily pre-set places. It is again unclear why this is done so sporadically, e.g. with the four seventeenth-century editions put out by Hackius (A-96, 98, 100, 106). No references to other bibliographies are given for these books, but all have long been described in the BL printed catalogue.

Where the Riedel library has a real advantage over others is in its extensive collection of German theses and programmes of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. I imagine a good number of these are not found elsewhere, or not found in this concentration. Whether classical scholars will still want or need to consult this material, other than for the occasional mild pleasure of giving an emendation to an earlier proponent, I cannot say. A defective memory has blotted out which Horatian scholar said of another that his observations 'have put on record that their author thought he could ignore a century's critical work on these problems'. There is a couple of centuries' worth awaiting the next critical scholar in Groningen.

London MARTIN DAVIES

M. T. CAMILLONI: *Le Muse*. Pp. xix + 219. Rome: Editori Riuniti, 1998. Paper, L. 30,000. ISBN: 88-359-4534-8.

This study is primarily concerned with two questions: the original meaning of the word μοῦσα and the rôle of the Muses in Horace's poetry. The etymology of μοῦσα is a notorious problem on which there is no scholarly agreement: the word is variously derived, for example, from *mont-ia (cf. Latin *mons*), *mendh- (cf. μανθάνω), or *men- (cf. μιμνήσκω). C. discusses these and other hypotheses, but finds them unsatisfactory because they fail to take into account the close association between the Muses and water. All the cult places of the Muses have one or more springs, and the Muses themselves have much in common with water nymphs. C. herself suggests that the word μοῦσα is of Semitic rather than of Indo-European origin, and that it derives from a root which signifies the flowing out of water. The Muse is thus in origin a divinity who presides over the sources of song, not only in a metaphorical sense as the inspirer of poetry, but also literally as the goddess of springs. I have no idea whether this theory is etymologically plausible, but C.'s review of the problem is useful.

The real interest of this book, however, lies in C.'s treatment of Horace, and in her argument that Horace assigns specific functions to each of the individual Muses whom he names. Six of the nine canonical Muses appear in the *Odes*, but generally speaking commentators have found little significance in the references to different Muses. So, for example, R. Nisbet and M. Hubbard (*A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book 1* [Oxford, 1970]) on the invocation to Melpomene at *Odes* 1.24.3 speak of Horace's 'indifference' concerning the names of the Muses, pointing out that 'poets could of course already play with the idea that different Muses had different provinces . . . but the assignment of provinces was still vague; certainly in our passage we can draw no inference from the fact that Melpomene later became the Muse of tragedy'. C. attempts to prove otherwise, backing her argument up with a survey of the Muses in art and literature from Homer to the Augustan age. Her catalogue of references to the Muses in Greek and Latin literature is judicious, but contains no surprises. As far as iconography is concerned (and here C.'s survey is particularly useful for the Hellenistic period onwards, which is not covered by the article on the Muses in the *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Graecae*), C. documents the development in the use of different attributes for individual Muses, and notes a tendency towards standardization in the second and first centuries B.C. Of particular importance for Horace is the *aedes Herculis Musarum*, a temple dating from the second century B.C. and restored in 29 B.C., which contained statues of the Muses with their various attributes.

C.'s general argument has a certain force, for it is difficult to imagine that a poet as meticulous as Horace would mention individual Muses at random. Thus the invocation to Calliope, according to Hesiod the most important of the Muses, who attends on kings, is entirely appropriate in *Odes* 3.4.1–4, a poem which celebrates the deeds of Augustus and offers him 'lene consilium'. Similarly the choice of Clio, traditionally associated with praise and fame, is clearly significant in *Odes* 1.12.2, which sings the praises of Jupiter and Augustus. But why does Horace invoke Euterpe and Polyhymnia at the beginning of his collection (*Odes* 1.1.33)? According to C., these two Muses represent the themes that are dearest to Horace's heart: the joys of wine, love, and friendship (the 'carpe diem' theme), and the more public celebration of the virtues of the 'middle way' in civic life (the 'medietas' theme). This is an attractive enough idea, but it is difficult

to see how it can be derived from the text, or from the evidence that we have about the Muses at this stage. I have similar doubts about C.'s interpretations of Thalia (*Odes* 4.6) and Melpomene. It is not inconceivable that she is right in seeing an allusion to Melpomene as the Muse of tragic poetry in *Odes* 1.24.3, the lament on the death of Quintilius, since iconographical evidence suggests that Melpomene was already associated with tragedy in Horace's day. But it is difficult to agree that Horace's choice of Melpomene to crown him with Delphic laurel in the final lines of *Odes* 3.30 has much to do with tragedy.

The detailed interpretations which C. offers may not always be convincing, but there is a lot of information in this book. However, the lack of a bibliography and an index make it more difficult to use as a reference work than it should be.

University of Warwick PENELOPE MURRAY

A. CAVARZERE: *Sul Limitare: Il 'motto' e la poesia di Orazio.* (Testi e Manuali per l'Insegnamento Universitario del Latino, 47.) Pp. 299. Bologna: Pàtron, 1996. Paper, L. 35,000. ISBN: 88-555-2399-6.

This book, expanded from an article Cavarzere was invited to write for the *Enciclopedia Oraziana*, sketches the origin of the term 'motto' used by students of Horace, attempts to define the characteristics of such mottoes, outlines evidence for their use in Greek and Latin literature before Horace, and examines his practice in detail. The indexes of the commentaries of Nisbet and Hubbard on Books 1 and 2 of Horace's *Odes* refer to mottoes only at 1.9 (Alcaeus), 1.12 (Pindar), 1.16 (Stesichorus), 1.18, 1.37 (Alcaeus), and 2.18 (Bacchylides), and there are passing references to mottoes on pp. xii and xiii of their introduction to Book 1. No definition of the term is advanced, and the purpose of Horace in using them is not discussed. In addition to these examples C. discerns more or less probable mottoes at *Odes* 1.4, 1.14, 1.15 (Alcaeus), 1.23 (Anacreon), 2.6 (Catullus), 2.7 (Archilochus—'hypothetical'), and 2.16 (Catullus); however, the motto in 1.16 is qualified as 'hypothetical'. In Books 3 and 4 he catalogues 3.22 (Catullus), 3.30 (Pindar and Simonides), 4.3 (Hesiod and Callimachus), 4.5 (Ennius!), 4.10 (Virgil), 4.15 (Propertius and Callimachus) with 3.5 (Hermocles Cyzicus, *CA*, p. 173–4), 3.12 (Alcaeus), 3.20 (Homer!), and 4.12 (Catullus) as doubtful. Some mottoes drawn even from prose works are considered to be possible.

Ancient poets learned their craft by the study of earlier poetry: this fact and the limitations imposed by their metres meant that phrases used by earlier writers tended to recur later. Hence an audience might not attribute any importance to such repetitions. Modern scholars feel sure that Horace's mottoes were intended to have a significance for the poetically educated. All seem to agree that the mottoes were placed by Horace at the beginning of his poems; some (e.g. F. Fraenkel, *Horace* [Oxford, 1957]), p. 159), believe that 'only the opening words of a Greek poem are taken over'. C., whilst admitting that the memorable quality of an incipit made it suitable for borrowing as a motto, refuses to accept the restriction to such phrases (p. 259). Direct citation or quotation can put the intention to refer to another passage beyond doubt, as when *Iliad* 6.146 is quoted at Simonides *fr. eleg.* 19.1–2 W^2 or the initial line of Theocritus *Id.* 29 appeals to the authority of Alcaeus 366. The closer the resemblance to the earlier parallel the more likely it is that the connexion was intended to be noted. Yet how are we to determine where the dividing line was to be drawn? It seems that very memorable passages must have had a special suitability to act as mottoes: unfortunately certainty as to what was especially memorable is not easily attained. Neither is Horace's purpose easily divined. Fraenkel sees the use of mottoes as a sign of a classicizing movement C. (p. 64) adopts the view of G. B. Conte that the motto represents a kind of generic guarantee that the 'valori poetici (letterari ed extraletterari)' of the predecessor will be found in the new poem. He also accepts the strange view of D. Feeney that Horace's mottoes are a compliment not only to the earlier poet, but also to the scholars who catalogued poems under their incipits and an anticipation that Horace will also merit such cataloguing in the canon of lyric poets. Since scholars have to infer Horace's intentions from his practice, they may come to different conclusions, and then they will naturally discern mottoes in different poems. For instance, C. inclines to deny that 3.12.1 is a motto, though many scholars felt sure that it is.

If such doubts are possible when conditions are favourable, we may expect greater uncertainty in tracing mottoes in earlier Latin poetry and in Hellenistic poetry. The possible Hellenistic mottoes that C. adduces seem to me to be too doubtful to show much more than the obvious

truth that Hellenistic poets were products of a bookish and backward-looking culture. Of two possible mottoes in Callimachus, the first (*Aetia*, *SH* 254.1) has Pindaric features, but does not allude clearly to any single surviving passage. The second (*Iambi*, fr. 191.1 Pf) was argued by some to echo a fragment of Hipponax, but the very existence of that fragment (cf. 1 W^2) is, despite C.'s advocacy, extremely doubtful. Although a great amount of sincere work has been done, the prolix presentation, the uncertainty of the results, and the lack of an *index rerum* make the book no easy read.

University College, Dublin J. A. RICHMOND

A. Rowe: *For Lucasta with Rue, a Collection of Poems by A. E. Housman, Q. Horatius Flaccus and Others*. Pp. 89. Lewes: The Book Guild Ltd, 1999. Cased, £12.95. ISBN: 1-85776-374-2.

This is a collection of forty-three poems in English (all but one by A.E.H.) and forty-two in Latin (mostly by Q.H.F., but seventeen by others ranging from Catullus to Alcuin). Its unusual feature is that English and Latin poems are printed alternately on facing pages, juxtaposing the different languages.

'The art is to hide the art, and simple as it all may seem, the poems have been set against each other in such a way as to draw the reader irresistibly into reflection on their affinities and associations, contrasts and disparities.' So warbles the blurb (drawn from the Introduction by a well-known champion of the classics). Fiddlesticks! There is no art in the juxtaposition. The arrangement is purely alphabetical, with separate sequences for English and Latin. The index demonstrates this, and it is expressly stated in the Acknowledgements.

It does not follow that the exercise is necessarily to be regarded as frivolous. The interleaving compels comparison of the pairs of facing poems. Admirers of both authors may well start with a notion of affinity between them. After all, A.E.H., the great Latinist, translated *Diffugere nives* (original and translation both appear here, though not confronted), and they shared certain characteristics, such as employability and a propensity for writing about love, death, drinking, etc. in short-line quatrains. But it is the contrasts which are highlighted here, both in the few cases where there is some similarity of subject matter, e.g. *When the lad for longing sighs* / *Vixi puellis* (love), *Could man be drunk forever* / *Bacchum in remotis* (wine), as well as in the numerous cases where there is none. The truth is that a vast gulf of culture and personality separates the two: Q.H.F. outgoing, adaptable, a survivor, at home with the religion, philosophy, and regime of his time, blessed with an aptitude for happiness, and above all proud of the literary monument he had built; A.E.H. austere, morose, a stranger and afraid in a world he never made, emotionally stunted, obsessed with death, whose monument was his scholarship, and to whom his own poetry resembled a morbid secretion, like the pearl in the oyster. This anthology helps to demonstrate the gulf. The warbler is not so far off song.

The book is nicely printed (although one could wish that the very short poems had not been crammed against the top of the page) in attractive hard covers at a giveaway price. It will be an asset to any bedside bookshelf. The compiler expresses the hope that it 'may find its way to people who can enjoy it as much as I still do'. Amen to that.

Lincoln's Inn COLIN SYDENHAM

A. Álvarez Hernández: *La poética de Propercio. Autobiografía artística del 'Calimaco romano'* (Accademia properziana del Subasio). Pp. 336. Assisi: Tipolitografia Porziuncola, 1997. L. 50,000.

The present volume is the second in the series *Propertiana*, which began in 1995 with Marco Buonocore's *Properzio nei codici della Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana.* A.H.'s study is a revised version of a doctoral thesis, directed by Paolo Fedeli and Amalia Nocito and accepted by the Universidad de Buenos Aires in 1996. The author finds in the progression of the text of P. a coherent ordering of his poetics developed in successive stages. In the *Monobiblos* the polemic with Ponticus reveals that P. recaptures the ideals of Callimachus and Catullus: a neat opposition between *docta*, *leuis*, *mollis* poetry and *magna*, *gravis*, *dura* poetry. But the *docta* poetics,

apart from being an aesthetic model, is also an existential paradigm: the poet, *servus amoris*, lives and sings in a particular world that he shares with his *domina.* For A.H., the deepest change takes place in Book 2 under the increasing influence of the imperial circle of Maecenas. P. transcends the limits of the personal theme to become a love writer inserted in a consecrated poetic tradition. The subject matter of the writing is no longer Cynthia but *deus Amor.* From this change the erotic writing will deal with subjects and forms of greater social transcendence and greater civic commitment. The poetics of Book 3 confirms the power that elegiac poetry has to make men immortal and the priestly rôle of the poet. A.H. distinguishes a new type of definition—already exercised by Virgil and Horace—that implies that the poet assumes the institutional function of *sacerdos.* In Book 4 P.'s project consists of elevating the erotic matter and smoothing the heroic or mythical matter, so that they can coexist in a homogeneous whole. A.H. argues that in order to understand P.'s last project it is enough to frame it in the general tendency of Roman Callimacheanism, guided by Virgil, Horace, and Maecenas. The elegy can recover for itself the virtues of the great Augustan poetry and the poet can transform himself into *vates.*

The work of A.H., written with clarity and rigorous method, constitutes an original contribution to the studies on P., and, according to Paolo Fedeli's words in his preface, 'affrontata in una visione d'insieme, la poetica properziana trova qui una sistemazione rigorosa e convincente'. A thorough bibliography and helpful index complete the study.

Universidad Nacional del Sur, Argentina EMILIO ZAINA

D. Liuzzi: *M. Manilius,* Astronomica, Libro V. Pp. 233. Galatino: Congedo Editore, 1997. Paper. ISBN: 8-8808-6169-7.

This is the fifth and presumably final volume of an edition that debuted in 1990, after try-outs in other venues. The first four volumes were not reviewed in this journal, rightly, and this one merits only apotropaic notice. It consists, like its four brethren, of a brief introduction, text, translation, and commentary. The text is based on the second edition of Housman, published after his death in 1937 under the direction of A. S. F. Gow. In an appendix, L. provides a list of 104 instances in which her text diverges from Housman's in this book of 745 lines. The proportion is roughly similar in the other four books. More often than not L. reverts to a discredited reading of the paradosis. The accompanying Italian translation strikes me as a reasonably faithful rendering of the resulting gibberish. The commentary is entirely tralatitious, containing no useful information that cannot be found in Housman or Goold or even van Wageningen (!), and much that is useless besides. The reader in search of a spirited engagement with Housman in defense of the medieval tradition will search in vain, for L. believes in assertion not argument. This volume, like the others, concludes with an *index verborum* keyed to L.'s text of this book, apparently for the benefit of the many readers of Manilius who lack access to a reference library or the PHI CD-ROM. Sad it is to contemplate the deforested hillsides that supplied pulp for this edition.

University of Colorado, Boulder PETER E. KNOX

G. Rosati (ed.): *P. Ovidii Nasonis Heroidum Epistulae XVIII–XIX: Leander Heroni, Hero Leandro*. (Biblioteca Nazionale: Serie dei classici greci e latini: testi con commento filologico, 4.) Pp. 268. Florence: Felice le Monnier, 1996. Paper, L. 70,000. ISBN: 88-00-81283-X.

An apology is owed the publisher and author for the late appearance of this review, which is entirely the fault of the reviewer.

The authenticity of the double *Heroides* has understandably absorbed most critical attention over the years, and the debate has already rumbled on with E. Courtney's reply in *CJ* 93 (1998), 157–66, both to R. (who regards the issue as quite settled in favour of Ovidian authorship) and to E. J. Kenney (whose edition with commentary of the six double epistles appeared in the Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics series in 1996). (Incidentally, neither Kenney nor R. were able to take account of M. Beck's work on the authenticity of 18 and 19, as it was published simultaneously with their own. See, however, Kenney's review in *CR* 48 [1998], 311–13.)

R. is known to me principally for his short but truly outstanding 1985 commentary on Ovid's *Medicamina.* The present commentary on the Hero and Leander pair of epistles consists of twenty pages of introduction, a new text, and almost 200 pages of commentary. Roughly one couplet is covered on each page of commentary, which indicates a different scale of treatment from that found in Kenney. This allows R. to follow the gradual unfolding of the poems at the verbal and thematic levels more closely than Kenney was able in his more note-oriented format. In the introduction R. usefully compares the treatments of the Hero and Leander myth found in Musaeus and Ovid, and considers the effect of the genre of epistle on the latter. Some attention is also given the dramatic integration of Ovid's pair of letters. Best of all, it is shown how the themes of delay and expectation serve to characterize Hero's rather limited domestic world but, by contrast, serve to emphasize the 'frustrato attivisimo' of Leander. In the commentary itself, R. is particularly good at establishing topoi and then relating them in an illuminating fashion to the text; see, for example, the notes on 18.13–14 (on the theme of parental opposition), 18.37–52 (something new on the *exclusus amator*), and 19.11–12 (on the differences between the forum and the agora in the erotic sphere). Another welcome feature is the willingness to explain basic language usage, such as the application of *currere* (18.6) or *dare verbera* (18.23) to swimming. Other commentators might have been content to pass these over as conventional poetic usage, but R. is prepared to think them through afresh and explain the metaphors and contamination of ideas which lie behind them. He is even ready to spend time on 'empty' conceits, such as 18.85 *ut procul aspexi lumen, 'meus ignis in illo est'*, with good results. Throughout admirable use is made of secondary literature. Reference is made to much recent work on the *Heroides*, and many useful items less familiar to the anglophone reader are brought to the attention. Like Kenney, R. does not systematically divide the poems into sections for introductory comment, but prefers to write notes to longer sections as the occasion arises. This respects the fact that the poem itself is undemarcated in formal terms, but does make it harder to know what to look out for in the coming lines. Nevertheless, R. does ensure that a theme introduced in a note on a line or couplet is followed up or supplemented in later notes.

In sum, this is a piece of scholarship which, while not breaking any moulds, sets the highest standard for further research on this pair of poems.

University of Manchester R. K. GIBSON

A. Loupiac: *La poétique des éléments dans* La Pharsale *de Lucain.* (Collection Latomus 241.) Brussels: Latomus, Revue d'Études Latines, 1998. Paper. ISBN: 2-87031-181-8.

The past decade has seen a growing interest in Lucan. Many studies explore new dimensions of his disharmonious epic *Bellum civile*, e.g. its relations with Neronian tastes and themes, or its Roman preoccupation with 'spectacle'. Surprisingly, nothing of this is reflected in the new monograph by Loupiac, a reworked French thesis.

L.'s purpose is first to study the rôle of the elements (earth, fire, water, and air) in the poem and then to establish their symbolic value or significance. The former task is simple enough: in separate chapters, the occurrences of each element are listed and commented upon. This philological work is done with great precision, though in these chapters secondary literature (other than a few titles) is only sparingly referred to; not even L.'s own earlier article on the elements is mentioned: 'La poétique des éléments dans la Pharsale', in *BAGB* (1991), 247–66. As a whole it does not make very inspiring reading, but it may be called useful. The symbolic analysis, however, relies heavily on a handful of psychoanalytic studies and does not yield significant results. On the one hand, it hardly surpasses the fairly widespread notion that the elements exemplify the cosmic dimensions of the civil war as it is illustrated and amplified by the poet. On the other hand, L. enters a more dangerous field by speculating about the personal anxieties of the poet, who is argued to be obsessed with 'images of death'.

In classical studies, this biographical and psychological approach was not uncommon after World War II, but nowadays it looks decidedly outdated. Surely, we no longer need to refer to psychological characteristics such as a haunting fear of decomposition, if we wish to explain graphical descriptions of death and destruction. Lucan's poem by its very theme focuses on the disruptive effects of civil war: so how could the poet have avoided the motif? Nor does the generalizing assumption that Lucan has the typically 'Andalusian' taste for the horrific and violent (p. 210) satisfy any more. Lucan is also seen by L. as a sensitive, fragile person having to

live in sombre days, a man captured by a lofty ideal, which led to his death. Such views turn back the clock in Lucanean scholarship.

But whatever one's starting point and approach, be it trendy or traditional, it is imperative to take notice of recent discussions. In this respect, L.'s study is most disappointing. With few exceptions, the Lucanian studies in its bibliography are well-known items from the sixties and seventies, such M. P. O. Morford's *The Poet Lucan* (Oxford, 1967) and F. Ahl's *Lucan: an Introduction* (Ithaca, 1976). Other items include French dissertations, and studies on psychoanalysis. Generally speaking, French contributions greatly outnumber the rest, and many relevant studies are missing. It is, to put it mildly, astonishing to find the important British study of Jamie Masters, *Poetry and Civil War in Lucan's* Bellum Civile (Cambridge, 1992), not even mentioned. There must have been sufficient time for L. to discuss some of Masters's thought-provoking ideas, e.g. his view that on a metapoetical level 'civil war' itself is a metaphor determining the composition of the poem. (A minor cavil: L. states as a fact without discussion that Lucan's 'last words', alluded to by Tacitus, were his own lines 3.635–46; see, however, my contribution to that question in Carl Deroux [ed.], *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History VI* [Collection Latomus 217, Brussels, 1992], pp. 390–407.) As L.'s book stands, it would have been welcomed thirty or twenty years ago. Unfortunately, the same cannot be said nowadays.

University of Leiden VINCENT HUNINK

S. MARCUCCI: *Analisi e interpretazione dell'*Hercules Oetaeus. Pp. 347. Pisa: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali, 1997. Paper. ISBN: 88-8147-128-0.

M.'s study of *Hercules Oetaeus* (like her I shall call the author 'Anonymous') consists of four chapters: Chapter 1 examines two antecedents, Sophocles' *Trachiniae* and Ovid's *Metamorphoses* 9.1–272; Chapter 2 investigates the play's connections with tragic Seneca section by section; Chapter 3 considers the play's female portraits in relation to Ovidian heroines; while Chapter 4 concerns the influence of Lucan on the portrait of Hercules.

M. notes important differences between Sophocles and Anonymous: Sophocles' strict separation of Deianira and Hercules is replaced by a prologue involving Hercules; Iole's rôle is transformed into a prisoners' chorus; the different handling of the characterization of Deianira, the new Deianira resembling Clytemnestra or Medea; and the addition of a chorus of Calydonian women as companions to Deianira. But the most important difference between Sophocles and Anonymous is the handling of the Nurse, for it is she who prepares the poisoned robe in *Oetaeus.* The account of Hercules' agony has much in common with that of Sophocles, though with the addition of Ovidian and Euripidean elements, while the appearance of Alcmene is wholly un-Sophoclean. As for the *Metamorphoses*, M. argues that Ovid's elaboration of the Sophoclean plot is fundamental for understanding the developments present in the Latin tragedy.

Chapter 2 works systematically through the play noting Senecan parallels. M. begins this chapter by observing that Seneca functions as the author's linguistic–expressive model: Deianira seeks to emulate the Juno of *Hercules Furens*, while the Senecan hero belongs to this Hercules' past. Act 1, much less informative than a Senecan prologue, makes use of Seneca's *Hercules* and *Agamemnon*. The chorus of Oechalian prisoners led by Iole recalls the choruses of Trojan prisoners in *Agamemnon* and *Troades*, with Iole being closely modelled on Cassandra. Act 2 presents a scene similar to Senecan second acts: a character expresses hatred and the desire for revenge to an inferior. Here Seneca's Clytemnestra, Medea, and Phaedra are models. The criticism of the hero himself (as opposed to particular aspects) suggests to M. a late second- or third-century date for the play. This is the most Senecan section of the drama. The second chorus consists of Calydonian women, supporters of Deianira. Here it is possible to detect use of *Hercules Furens*, *Medea*, *Oedipus*, and even *Octavia.* Although Deianira's Act 3 narrative is clearly based on Sophocles, later sections are obviously based on Senecan plays, especially *Hercules.* As with other odes, the third chorus uses Senecan ideas, but even more striking is its debt to Silius' *Punica*, as Zwierlein had observed. Act 4 is more faithful to the Greek plot, but even so there are Senecan reminiscences, most notably of *Agamemnon*, *Medea*, *Oedipus*, and *Hercules.* There is little to say on Senecan influences on the fourth chorus. Act 5 owes least to Senecan influence.

Chapter 3 is concerned with female portraits in *Oetaeus* and their relationship to Ovidian and non-Ovidian heroines. Here *Heroides* 9 is particularly important. However, M. begins with Iole,

suggesting *Heroides* 3, Ovid's treatment of Briseis, a woman in like circumstances, as a precedent. The parallel, however, is not explored in detail. The representation of Deianira is more complex, compounded as she is of both Senecan and Ovidian elements: 'Ovid completes Seneca'. Anonymous' Deianira relives and synthesizes the female experiences of Virgil's Dido and Catullus' Ariadne as well as the Ovidian Deianira.

In Chapter 4, M. argues that in the last part of the tragedy there emerges a third important model, Lucan, for the portrait of Hercules is based on a number of his characters. Here, too, other authors come into play: Ovid's Hercules and Caeneus from the *Metamorphoses*, Statius' Tydeus and Capaneus from the *Thebaid.* Lucan's emphasis on death is important, especially those of Scaeva and Pompey, and of Cato's soldiers by snakebite in Book 9.

M.'s study presents an exhaustive account of intertextual relationships in *Oetaeus.* In my view, the book's chief problem is that, although M. is alert to the play's numerous allusions to and rewritings of earlier texts, she needs to consider at greater length how Anonymous uses them to generate meaning. Parallels are not enough. She refers with approval to Gian Biagio Conte's distinction (*The Rhetoric of Imitation* [Ithaca, 1986], p. 31) between the 'modello esemplare' (exemplary model) and the 'modello codice' (model as code), saying that Seneca functions as both for Anonymous (p. 231). However, she does not make enough use of that distinction. Intertextuality is central to many contemporary discussions of Latin literature, but the best work (e.g. that of Barchiesi, Conte, Hinds, and Kennedy) operates at a more sophisticated level than is to be found here.

University of Tasmania P. J. DAVIS

D. Share (ed.): *Seneca in English* (Poets in Translation). Pp. xxx + 254. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1998. Paper, £9.99. ISBN: 0-14-044667-2.

This very welcome addition to the 'Poets in Translation' series, Don Share's catholic and judicious selection of translations from Seneca, not only raises a stimulating set of possibilities for readers who begin their exploration from the Latin text, but also acts as a self-standing history of Seneca's crucial influence on the course of English Literature. As one might expect, the anthology is divided into three sections, Renaissance, Interim (briefly covering the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries), and Modern, reflecting the fact that the two moments at which Seneca was most present as a shaping force in English are marked by works such as Thomas Sackville and Thomas Norton's verse drama, *Gorboduc* (1561), and, in the twentieth century, T. S. Eliot's 'Marina' and *Sweeney Agonistes*, and the stripped-down blood-thirstiness of Ted Hughes's extraordinary *Oedipus* (1968), which is represented by two generous extracts here.

The crucial status of Seneca in the English Renaissance can hardly be overemphasized. Whether or not the englishing of a chorus from *Hercules Octaeus* is actually the work of Elizabeth I herself may be open to question, but the fact that it was long considered to be her work in itself emphasizes the degree to which Seneca shared with Boethius the position of moral instructor as well as literary exemplar for the early-modern period. (Here, I fear, at least a quibble about S.'s scholarship has to be entered—he helpfully advises the reader that the passage was 'transcribed by Horace Walpole in 1806'. Now Walpole had access, it must be conceded, to a surprisingly wide range of manuscript material. Despite this, perhaps he lacked the capacity to undertake editorial tasks so long after his death in 1797.) Before returning to the praise which this anthology is due, it is necessary to enter the further caveat that the arrangement of S.'s book makes it unnecessarily difficult to learn whence precisely he has derived any given text—the final bibliography of 'Editions of Seneca in English' is useful in so far as it goes, but it does not really function as a finding-list for the sources of the texts which are included. Dates are usually given for published texts, but not consistently for antiquarian reprints or subsequent editions. (Also, maddeningly and, one fears, indicatively, T. S. Eliot's works are cited only with references to American editions. This obviously does not prevent the European reader from finding the passages cited, but it is, at best, a discourtesy.) If, as is to be hoped, this compilation goes into a second edition, surely these shortcomings require attention.

This is particularly so in that selections are in themselves consistently of the greatest interest on a number of levels: S. has been diligent in tracking down little-known translators such as John Studley (?1545–?1590), whose versions of *Medea* and *Agamemnon* were published while he was an undergraduate at Cambridge in 1563. Such material is allowed to argue its merits by virtue of

being placed alongside more familiar works such as Ben Jonson's *Sejanus* and John Webster's revenge tragedies. This is where the anthology works most effectively, as S. painstakingly locates passages of Senecan origin in works which are not avowedly Senecan. Similarly, the recognition of Eliot's violent fragment of a jazz drama, *Sweeney Agonistes*, as essentially Senecan is typical of the wide-ranging intelligence of this selection. Among contemporary translators, the crypto-Poundian Douglas Parker is something of a find, as is the Northumbrian Jane Elder. Caryl Churchill provides what must be the bleakest rendering of *Thyestes* in the whole English tradition with her devastating conclusion:

> Let's not be frightened
> You'd have to be really
> greedy for life
> if you didn't want to die when the whole world's
> dying with you.

In a sense, the ideal reader for this compilation is the undergraduate or junior postgraduate student who is eager to develop a real sense either of the background of Renaissance literary culture or of the history of translation of the Classics in English. The usefulness of the book does not end there: it contains much recovered verse which can be read for the pleasures offered by its idiosyncrasy and vigour. In the context of 'Renaissance Studies' or the study of the history of drama, the utility of this compilation is obvious. For those whose base is essentially in the Classics, but who are following the current movement to a greater interest in the *Nachleben* of the classical texts, S.'s anthology offers an illuminating 'history of reading'. Given all these qualities, it is not unreasonable to ask the compiler and the (worryingly) slack publisher's editor to bring the referencing and the scholarly apparatus of the book up to a minimally acceptable standard.

University of Warwick PETER DAVIDSON
ANDREW BISWELL

Rosa M. Marina Sáez: *La métrica de los epigramas de Marcial: Esquemas rítmicos y esquemas verbales*. Pp. 340. Zaragoza: Institución 'Fernando el Católico', 1998. Paper. ISBN: 84-7820-374-5.

The great variety not only of themes, but also of metres in Martial's epigrams is one of their most outstanding features, and yet, apart from C. Giarratano's study *De M Val. Martialis re metrica* (Naples, 1908), there has previously been no comprehensive study of Martial's metrics. R. M. Marina Sáez's book now offers a wealth of statistics on, for example, verse structure, caesura, elision, verse ending, and the relation between accent and *ictus.* These statistics represent the results harvested from a computer program developed at the University of Zaragoza.

Since M.S. does not cite the respective poem or verse numbers on which the statistics are based, we must simply have faith in this program. Considering that it analysed around 10,000 of Martial's verses, an index apportioning these to their particular metrical pigeonhole would simply have made this book too long in any case. She does, however, list all metrical phenomena used only rarely in the epigrams, such as monosyllabic words in final position, spondaic hexameter endings or rarely used verse systems; of her two examples for iambic trimeters *κατὰ στίχον* (p. 275), the corrupt epigram 6.12 may in fact be a combination of a trimeter with a dimeter (cf. F. Grewing's commentary to Book 6 [Göttingen, 1997], pp. 135f.), and 11.17 should read 11.77.

Unlike Giarratano, M.S. very sensibly concentrates on a comparison between Martial's metrical usage and that of his contemporaries and predecessors. However, the conclusions drawn from her numerous comparative statistics are very general. We are told frequently that Martial's metrics betray Catullan, Virgilian, or Ovidian as well as contemporary influences, and that there are also some metrical features that Martial himself introduced into Latin poetry. M. also points out similarities to the *Carmina Priapea*, interpreting these as features typical of the genre, but she also focuses on differences between the two epigram collections. After reading this book, we are left with little more than the vague impression that Martial's metrics display a bit of everything.

One might have hoped to see all these statistics analysed as regards, say, their possible bearing on Martial's debt to other poets. It is, furthermore, unfortunate that M.S. has chosen to remain

within the bounds of her statistically oriented approach to the exclusion of any attempt to look at internal metrical relationships within given poems. She does, however, offer a very useful survey of the development of Martial's metrical usage through all fifteen books, and it is interesting to see that there is no linear development in his verse technique.

Other very welcome features of the book are M.S.'s comprehensive summaries of previous studies on individual aspects of Martial's metrics as well as an exhaustive bibliography, making her work invaluable for all scholars who come across a particular metrical phenomenon in the epigrams and want to explore this in the context of Martial's general metrical usage. Even if M.S.'s contribution to an actual evaluation of her statistics is limited, a compendium with all the information relevant to Martial's metrical art is now at least available.

University of Munich SVEN LORENZ

D. R. Slavitt: *Broken Columns. Two Roman Epic Fragments:* The Achilleid *of Publius Papinius Statius and* The Rape of Proserpine *of Claudius Claudianus*. Pp. xi + 98. Philadelphia: University of Philadelphia Press, 1998. Cased, £36.50 (Paper, £13.95). ISBN: 0-8122-3424-3 (0-8122-1630-X pbk).

The first sentence in the preface to this book contains a wince-making historical howler ('Statius was born in Naples between 45 and 60 A.D. in the reign of Domitian'), the second an equally jarring typo ('Augustulia'). Each is a venial error, of course, but together they at least serve to give warning that Slavitt's primary concern in offering us his versions of these two charming oddities of classical literature is not with the tedium of scholarly precision.

Fair enough: S. himself goes on to characterize his translation of *The Achilleid* as a 'rather breezy rendering' (p. x) while, in the afterword, David Konstan talks in terms of a 'sensitive and witty adaptation' (p. 96). At his best S. cuts loose from pedantic scrutiny of individual lines and phrases, and the liveliness and vigour of his narrative passages in particular well compensate for the loss of precision. One might single out for notice the splendid account of the way the disguised Achilles insinuates himself into Deidamia's affections (*Ach*. 1. 560–91) or the magnificent description of Pluto's chariot mangling the body of the giant Enceladus trapped beneath the weight of Mt Etna (*Rapt*. 2. 156–62). Individual phrases, too, are often rendered in effective, vivid ways, as when we are told Achilles' hair 'is electric, an animal's hackles' (for 'fronte relicta / surrexere comae', *Ach*. 1.855f.). Indeed, sometimes both the vigour and the wit even exceed what is to be found in the original. Pluto, for example, is given the gloriously grisly title 'lord of decomposition' (at *Rapt*. 1. 117), a phrase either Claudian or Statius might have relished. And the relatively bland words with which Jupiter expresses the power of Venus ('urere cuncta, / me quoque, saepe soles', *Rapt*. 1. 233f.) are delightfully expanded into middle-aged recollection of the lost pleasures of youth: ' ". . . when dawn / has turned the whole world to a pleasantly rumpled bed." / He sighed remembering the beds he had rumpled.'

But heavy payment is made for S.'s vividness and wit in the hard currency of Statius' *doctrina* and Claudian's historical neutrality. Konstan praises S.'s decision to cut out many of Statius' learned references on the grounds that 'footnotes and commentary . . . are death to poetry' and 'Statius' ironic sensibility does not depend on such pedantries' (p. 80). But to ignore his self-conscious display is to ignore much of what gives Statius the flavour of his age. The combination of allusion and a pathos bordering on sentimentality is likewise characteristic of Statius and much other first-century poetry, and here too S. does not quite succeed in communicating the tone. Compare, in particular, *Ach*. 1.175f. '(Patroclus) par studiis aevique modis, sed robore longe, / at tamen aequali visurus Pergama fato' with the English 'Achilles' friend and companion who follows / now and will follow him further to Troy's heights and beyond'. The cliché 'and beyond' perhaps aims at mournful understatement, but it is too flat and unfocused to communicate anything of the dignified resonance of 'aequali . . . fato'. More, we lose all the tragic contrast between the friends' matching fates and their ill-matched strength: the emphasis is not on Patroclus' loyalty, but on his inability to equal Achilles in battle—and yet it is also on the fact that, greater though he is in arms, Achilles will meet the same end. *aequali*, in other words, cuts both ways, and the effect is devastating. As for Claudian, he is credited with a post-modern sensitivity to his place in a long tradition, and then transformed into a half-commando, half-mediator of the late antique culture wars. The ecphrasis of Sicily (1.142–78) is given a

preface in which the narrator is made to declare 'I can do the geography lesson' and which ends 'May we have the first slide, please? / Thank you', while a poem on a pagan theme that ignores Christians altogether is turned into one that explicitly names them and tries to preach to them a quasi-Symmachean toleration (p. 49). In short, this translation has its merits, but it tends to trivialize one poet and over-interpret another. Although it bills itself as a resolutely non-scholarly enterprise, then, it nonetheless succeeds in committing both of the sins most common in contemporary criticism of classical literature.

University of Toronto MICHAEL DEWAR

D. R. SLAVITT: *Ausonius: Three Amusements*. Pp. xii + 87. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1998. Cased, £21.50. ISBN: 0-8122-3472-3.

The centrepiece of this slim and polished volume is, in S.'s own terms, a 'recreation' of A.'s pornographic *Cento Nuptialis*. This work will surely attract the most attention, but the two other 'amusements' deserve comment too.

A.'s *Commemorationes*, a motley series of poems dedicated to the memory of the rhetoricians and grammarians of Bordeaux, is not one of his more engaging or distinguished works. It is, however, characteristic of him in many ways, and S.'s choice is very welcome. The poems highlight A.'s preoccupation with the characters and the climate of letters and education in Southern France. As is the case with the selection of epigrams which closes the volume, S. employs a variety of verse forms, both with and without rhyme schemes; his modern idiom successfully captures A.'s changing tones.

In his version of the *Cento* S. gives expression to his scholarly and creative abilities. A. took lines or shorter units from the works of Virgil and joined them together to create new meanings and contexts—an episodic account of a wedding which ends up with a graphic narrative of consummation. S. rightly deems it 'impossible to translate' (p. xi). His recreation, which faces the Latin (but remember, this is not a translation and there are some very notable differences!) is a similar enterprise which uses not Virgil but Shakespeare. Tragedies, comedies, history plays, even the sonnets, as you have never seen them. Skill, wit, learning, poetic dexterity, and flabbergasting irreverence—very Ausonian, very amusing and impressive too.

Trinity Collge, Dublin ROGER REES

J.-P. CÈBE (ed.): *Varron,* Satires Ménippées. *Édition, traduction et commentaire, Vol. 12, Sexagessis—Testamentum*. Pp. xix–xxxi + 1894–2032, A-L. Rome: École française de Rome, 1998. Paper. ISBN: 2-7283-0541-2.

This volume, presumably the penultimate one, deals with frr. 485–543 B. from five satires, two of the best preserved (*Sexagesis* [C. prefers *Sexagessis*] and *Ταφὴ Μενίππου*), and three of which only a few frr. survive (*Σκιαμαχία*, *Synephebus*, and *Testamentum*). I find little to disagree with in C.'s text; in fr. 527, where the MSS have *qui in pistrino pinseret farinam*, Gataker's *far* is to be preferred since *far* is what is ground to produce *farina* and the corruption can easily be explained by the following *idem*; also the following citation in Nonius from *De vita p. R.* has *qui ruri far pinsebat*. C.'s only proposal is the tentative *φιλοφθογγία* for *φιλοφθονία* in fr. 542, which is an interesting idea but not compelling. The apparatus contains some inaccurate MSS readings (none of any great moment). C.'s treatment of F(lorentinus) is puzzling. In Books 1–3 it is a copy of L but is of value for the F^3 corrections; the other books were added in the fifteenth century and C. rightly omits it from his stemmata for Book 4 and Books 5–20. But he still records its variants not only in Books 1–3 but even in the later books. I suppose that the decision as to which conjectures should be recorded in the apparatus is a matter of judgement, but Iunius's *Μενίππου*: *ut antiqui* (fr. 524) should surely be mentioned (L has *menippu tantiqui*).

The discussion of the satires and of the individual fragments is on the whole convincing, though disagreement on points of detail is inevitable—I find, for example, his speculations on the

possible subject matter of *Synephebus* quite unpersuasive. Nor am I persuaded that fr. 510 refers to the Cynic σύντομος ὁδός to virtue—not so much because the road leads *ad eandem uoluptatem* but because it can be followed *sine ulla sollicitudine ac molestia*; usually the direct but hard way is contrasted with the tortuous but easy. In fr. 502 C. takes *quadripedem* as an adjective with *equam*; better, I think, since Varro always has it as a substantive (fr. 364; *Rust*. 1.20; *Ling*. 7.39), to take it substantively here. On fr. 517 where he prefers the tempting emendation *domusioni* he should at least point out that Nonius cites the fr. to illustrate a feminine form of *usus*, presumably *usio*. C. does not always cite the most appropriate parallels in his notes. On fr. 506 Varro's use of *calo* in *Ling*. 6.27 argues strongly for Bergk's emendation; on fr. 516 C.'s preference for *in terra pila* (with *pila* in apposition to *terra*) might have been shaken if he had observed *pila terrae* in *Ling*. 7.17 (admittedly a corrupt passage). For fr. 520 (*quod coeperas modo in uia narrare ut ad exodium ducas*) *Rust*. 2.1.1 provides a far better parallel than *Rust*. 1.2.2ff. On the human gestation period (fr. 543) he could have added references to Cens. 7 and Plut. *Placit*. 5.18 (*Mor*. 907f–908c), as well as Varro *ap*. Gell. 3.10.8. Oddly on the same fr. he omits the reference to the passage of Aristotle referred to by Varro—it is *HA* 7.4 (584a–b). More important are errors of various kinds. Three of the citations adduced as evidence for Socrates' baldness on fr. 490 (Pl. *Symp*. 2 15A; *Theaet*. 143E; Xen. *Conv*. 5) contain no such reference. On fr. 532 Palladius *Rust*. 1.37.4 is said to have *confluuium coquinae fusorium*; this is not the text in any edition I have ever seen. On fr. 540 C. says that the form *Adon* is 'attestée par Servius'—what Servius says is *'Adon' nusquam lectum est*: the form is attested by Probus. In fr. 539 C. regards the *infernus tenebrio*, κακὸς δαίμων, as Menippus, supporting his view (which I cannot accept) with the story in Suid. Φ 180 that Menippus went about dressed as a Fury, saying he had come from Hades to record sins. But C. has not noticed that Suidas took this story from D. L. 6.102 where it is told, not of Menippus, but of Menedemus. Crönert did indeed (while accepting that Suid. simply made a mistake) suggest that the story referred to Menippus as he appeared in his *Necyia*, but none of this is in C.

My verdict on this fascicle must be similar to that I have given on others—a useful edition with much of interest, but not to be relied on in points of detail.

University College, Dublin RAYMOND ASTBURY

T. J. Luce (trans.): *Livy:* The Rise of Rome. *Books 1–5* (Oxford World's Classics.) Pp. xxx + 372, 2 maps. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1998. Paper, £8.99. ISBN: 0-19-282296-9.

The scholarly interest in Livy has blossomed in the past decade, not only producing works that look at the merits of Livy's history and historiography, but also demonstrating the need for new translations and new commentaries. T. J. Luce's new translation of Books 1–5 of Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita* adds another offering to the growing list of translations in the Oxford World's Classics series. Unlike other works for which there are already a number of translations, Luce's rendering of Books 1–5 is the first in over thirty years. Aubrey de Sélincourt's translation in the Penguin series has long stood as the only option for those wanting Latinless students to read the primary extant source for Rome's early history. Although Sélincourt's translation has served its purpose, the liberties he took have never sat comfortably with those who desire a stronger reflection of the Latin. In contrast, Luce's translation follows not only the style but also the content of Livy's Latin with accuracy, allowing the reader to almost picture Livy's own words. At times, however, this faithfulness, particularly in the attempt to reflect participial clauses and ablative absolutes, interferes with the ease of reading that one would hope for in a translation.

A comparison of the following passages will demonstrate the differences between Luce's and Selincourt's translations:

> Preface 1.1–2: Livy, 'Facturusne operae pretium sim si a primordio urbis res populi Romani perscripserim nec satis scio nec, si sciam, dicere ausim, quippe qui cum ueterem tum uolgatam esse rem uideam, dum noui semper scriptores aut in rebus certius aliquid allaturos se aut scribendi arte rudem uestustatem superaturos credunt.'
>
> 'The task of writing a history of our nation from Rome's earliest days fills me, I confess, with some misgiving, and even were I confident in the value of my work, I should hesitate to say so. I am aware that for historians to make extravagant claims

> is, and always has been, all too common: every writer on history tends to look down his nose at his less cultivated predecessors, happily persuaded that he will better them in point of style, or bring new facts to light.' (Sélincourt)
>
> 'Whether in writing the history of the Roman people from the foundation of the city the result will be worth the effort invested, I do not really know (nor, if I did, would I presume to say so), for I realize that this is a time-honoured task that many have undertaken, each succeeding writer thinking he will either bring greater accuracy to the facts or surpass his unpolished predecessors in artistry and style.' (Luce)

In this example, Sélincourt divides Livy's long opening sentence in two, whereas Luce preserves the single sentence by appending a clause with no verbal link to the main sentence. While Sélincourt's translation is too free, perhaps Luce tries too hard to write in a Livian style.

> Book 1.29.5: Livy, 'iam continens agmen migrantium impleuerat uias, et conspectus aliorum mutua miseratione integrabat lacrimas, uocesque etiam miserabiles exaudiebantur mulierum, praecipue cum obsessa ab armatis templa augusta praeterirent ac uelut captos relinquerent deos.'
>
> 'The roads were packed with refugees in an unbroken line; pity at the sight of others as wretched as themselves renewed their tears; women—and men too—sobbed aloud as they passed the august temples where armed soldiers stood on guard, for it seemed they were leaving even their gods in captivity.' (Sélincourt)
>
> 'The streets were filled with an unbroken line of those departing, the sight of the others bringing forth fresh tears and shared anguish, made more intense by the cries of the women, especially as they passed the venerable temples where they had once worshipped and left their gods behind like so many captured prisoners.' (Luce)

In this second instance, from the destruction of Alba Longa, Sélincourt inexplicably adds 'and men too'. This addition violates the picture and the tone that Livy is attempting to portray. At the fall of cities, it is the women's voices that express despair. Luce again stacks up clauses, but he makes them dependent where Livy uses conjunctions and finite verbs. This stacking up of clauses is characteristic of Luce's style throughout the translation. Such a style often creates the feeling of rushing through the narrative, especially in contrast to the more florid style of Sélincourt's prose, or even Livy's Latin.

The translation is relatively error free: on p. 40 in Section 32, there is a problem with subject–verb agreement ('these people . . . is unjust'); on p. 253 in Section 33, 'flight' should be capitalized to begin the fifth sentence of the paragraph. The two maps (of Campagna and Rome) are helpful, as are the notes—the best feature of the Oxford World's Classics series.

Has Luce's translation answered the need for a new and clear translation of Livy? Unfortunately, no. Is Luce's an acceptable translation that provides an alternative to Sélincourt? For some, yes. But there is still a need for a translation of Livy that is sensitive to the Latin but aware of the need for grace in the English.

Loyola University New Orleans T. DAVINA MCCLAIN

A. Stramaglia (ed., trans.): *[Quintiliano]* I gemelli malati: *un caso di vivisezione (Declamazioni maggiori 8)*. Pp. 147. Cassino: Edizioni dell'Università degli Studi di Cassino, 1999. Paper, L. 35,000. ISBN: 88-8317-099-7.

The important Italian contribution to the study of Roman declamation continues with a new project, 'un ampio progetto di ricerca' on the pseudo-Quintilian Major Declamations, at the University of Cassino. When complete, this will provide both a complete Italian translation of these difficult pieces (Lewis A. Sussman has already blazed the trail in English) and studies of individual declamations, with introductory matter, translation, and notes. The volume under review is the first of these individual volumes. The introduction proper, by Lorenzo Greco,

interestingly summarizes ancient views on the two key features of Decl. 8, vivisection and twins, and usefully lists the points of resemblance between its wording and that of the closely related Decl. 5. Stramaglia himself provides an important *Nota al testo*, a learned and acute analysis of the problems raised by the transmission of the corpus as a whole. Admirable though it is, this analysis looks rather out of place in a volume whose Latin text is printed without any apparatus criticus (a lack, by the way, that makes the angle brackets round 'recipe quem mihi credidisti' in §5 very misleading). But despite that, the editor has thought through the many problems (though I should welcome a note on 'perituro . . . fato' at 1; 'una malattia senza speranze' is the right sense, but how do we get to it?). S. discusses them intelligently in his full notes, and his translation is always worth consulting. The bibliography is invaluable (though it lacks an old article by S. Vassis, praised in n. 120).

S.'s independence of mind is well illustrated by his willingness to take issue with the great and much regretted critic Lennart Håkanson, who edited these declamations for Teubner in 1982: rightly, I think, at nn. 80 (where [§15] one might think of deleting the first 'duobus'), 111, and 116; wrongly, in my judgement, at nn. 33, 118, and (perhaps) 44 (on §8, though I am not sure that the truth has yet been discovered there; see below). He makes conjectures of his own at 3 'artis suae <pretium>' and 17 'ex secto' (but the theme employs 'exseco'), and reports emendations of W. Hübner at 13 that I am not astronomer enough to judge. Many passages in such a difficult text naturally remain uncertain: 4 What does 'morte qua medicus parabatur' mean? 7 'magnorum parentum' can hardly be right (the run of the sentence does not favour S.'s view that 'magnorum' goes with what precedes). 14 Can 'numquam *ex hoc* rationem reddas' stand? I make some minor suggestions of my own: **4** quod etiam de <tam> similibus. Read merely 'quod de tam similibus'. *etiam* is without point; it could have arisen from a 'tam' added above the line and entering the text in the wrong place. **6** The point of the vexed sentence starting 'Facinus est . . .' (seen by Burman) is that it would be a scandal if the husband were to be let off the hook just because he is being accused under a restricted law that does not (the defence may successfully argue) apply to something so heinous as killing his son. Then read: 'si illa de minore dolore quereretur': 'if the mother were complaining of something less serious'. The next sentence should perhaps start: 'Itane [so Schultingh] matrona [transposed] impudenter facit quod pro detracto cultu . . .'. **8** Perhaps read: 'Frustra captas uideri simulatione (MSS ultione[m]) magnae caritatis ab omni curae ratione sepositus.' The husband, says the accuser, is trying to represent himself as having been excluded from the decision about his sons by the affection that led him to leave it to the doctor. In fact he felt no such affection, and it is mothers who get 'excluded' (6 'seposita'). Cf. 4 'Vultis intellegere, iudices, nihil inpatientia caritatis fecisse patrem? Non retulit ad matrem.' **9** 'Sepono paulisper immanitatem patris qui credidit; [et] . . . queri totius generis humani nomine uolo.' For the asyndeton cf. 16 'differo paulisper quod . . .; publico potius mortalitatis contendo nomine . . .'. **17** 'deprenderint' (for the rhythm) (perhaps also 'reprendere' at 9).

In the notes, I miss a reference on 12 'nihil . . . uoluit esse rerum natura tam simile quod non aliqua proprietate secerneret' to Quintilian 10.2.10. I have doubts about the translation e.g. at 2 'et morborum . . . concessit' (in effect 'made illness part of the art of medicine'; cf. 16 'ratio sanitatis intercidit si consumit medicina tantundem'). I found almost no misprints, though in n. 120 read 'non interpungeva dopo *ingratae*'.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford MICHAEL WINTERBOTTOM

A. LIPPOLD: *Die Historia Augusta. Eine Sammlung römischer Kaiserbiographien aus der Zeit Konstantins*; foreword and index by G. H. Waldherr. Pp. xxvi + 281. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1998. Paper, DM 124. ISBN: 3-515-07272-1.

Adolf Lippold has done important work on the history of the fourth and fifth centuries in a long scholarly career which began with a doctoral thesis on Orosius in 1952. Unfortunately, although during the 1970s Lippold published some good articles on the *Historia Augusta*, which dealt with specific problems relating to particular passages, he subsequently became ever more obsessed with attempting to prove that the work as a whole is 'a collection of imperial biographies from the period of Constantine'. This theory is not only false and untenable, but also logically defective. To be sure, the *Historia Augusta* pretends to be written by six different men at various dates in the early fourth century, namely, (1) before the abdication of Diocletian

in 305, (2) between 1 May 305 and 25 July 306, while Constantius was Augustus, and (3) after Constantine had defeated Licinius in 324. But these claims to plural authorship and composition early in the fourth century were exploded in 1889, when a young and brilliant Jewish scholar, whose expertise lay primarily in Roman imperial prosopography and Latin epigraphy, pointed out that what the *Historia Augusta* says about its date and authorship is self-contradictory and hence totally untrustworthy, and argued that the whole work was composed in the very late fourth century. Theodor Mommsen immediately accepted the validity of Hermann Dessau's main conclusions. Mommsen had, however, made incautious use of the *Historia Augusta* as a source for the development of the Roman constitution in the late third century in his recently completed *Römisches Staatsrecht*. Perhaps understandably, he succumbed to the very human temptation to salvage his own credit as a historical critic by postulating that a 'Theodosian redactor' had revised and partly rewritten a collection of imperial biographies originally composed under Constantine. This theory allowed both Mommsen himself and Dessau to be correct on their own ground: although Dessau had indeed proved that the text reached its present shape towards 400, the passages adduced in the *Staatsrecht* belonged to a Constantinian core and could therefore be used as historical evidence.

At first sight, L. appears to be merely the last in a long line of scholars who have repeated Mommsen's theory without realizing its self-serving motivation. In reality, his position differs radically from that of Mommsen, who explicitly accepted all of Dessau's original arguments and merely excogitated a theory to avoid corollaries that he found unpalatable. L. repudiates Mommsen's acknowledgement of the validity of Dessau's arguments, which he rejects *in toto*—including Dessau's demonstration that the *Historia Augusta* uses and adapts Aurelius Victor's account of Septimius Severus (p. xi). Even Arnaldo Momigliano at his most sceptical, when he proclaimed the *Historia Augusta* to be 'an unsolved problem of historical forgery' in 1954, conceded that '*prima facie* the *Historia Augusta* appears to depend on Aurelius Victor' (who was writing in 360). Since 1954 Ernst Hohl, André Chastagnol, Ronald Syme, and others have adduced additional evidence and advanced new and powerful arguments, so that no one who evaluates the evidence and arguments rationally can now seriously doubt that the author of the *Historia Augusta* uses or alludes to Aurelius Victor not only in the *Vita Severi*, but also in several other passages.

The volume under review comprises an introduction dated 1998 and twenty very heterogeneous pieces published between 1968 and 1996. They are all reproduced photographically without addenda or corrigenda, and without the correction of some obvious misprints. Five items consider the *Historia Augusta* as a whole, twelve deal with individual emperors or *vitae*, and three with the presumed historical context in the early fourth century. Included are five articles from colloquia on the *Historia Augusta* and four from *Festschriften*, one entry in an encyclopedia and two brief reviews.

Most of the pieces in the volume did not deserve to be reprinted. Even if what L. says about the period of Constantine had genuine merit at the time of its original publication, it is now largely out of date. Too much of the volume comprises either defence of the author's monstrous commentary on the *Maximini duo* (nearly 700 pages to elucidate a mere twenty-eight pages of Teubner text notably lacking in historical content) or special pleading designed to support his mistaken date for the *Historia Augusta* as a whole. Hence, while L. briskly refutes attempts to detect allusions to fifth-century events and persons, he also denies the allusions to events and persons of the 390s which seem so transparent to virtually everyone else who has recently written on the subject.

University of Toronto T. D. BARNES

I. Gallo: *Studi sulla biografia greca* (Storia e Testi, 7.) Pp. 216. Naples: D'Auria, 1997. Paper. ISBN: 88-7092-129-8.

I. Gallo, L. Nicastri (edd.): *Biografia e autobiografia degli antichi e dei moderni.* (Publicazioni dell'Università degli Studi di Salerno: Sezione Atti, Convegni, Miscellani 45.) Pp. 321. Naples: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, 1995. Paper, L. 48,000. ISBN: 88-8114-093-4.

The first of these volumes reprints twelve of Italo Gallo's articles on ancient biography. The

majority are on the ancient biographical traditions about Pindar, especially the life contained in P.Oxy. 2438. There is also a review of Momigliano's *The Development of Greek Biography* (1971), two further general discussions, and a final chapter on biography as *Trivialliteratur (Alexander Romance, Life of Secundus the Silent Philosopher)*. Apart from the last, Gallo's interests here are in early biography and the development of biography, which he wants to push back into the Archaic period.

The second volume is an edited collection of miscellaneous studies on biographical texts and theories from antiquity to the 1990s. The first article by Gallo reappears in his collected papers. The following chapters on the ancient world treat lyric, the Aesop tradition, Plato, biography at Rome (Giorgio Brugnoli), physiognomy in Suetonius (Fabio Stok), and Jerome. Of the six remaining chapters, the longest and most interesting (by Giuseppe Cacciatore) concerns the intellectual climate of biography in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and the theories of Dilthey and Misch.

University of Warwick SIMON SWAIN

W. HANSEN (ed.): *Anthology of Ancient Popular Literature*. Pp. xxix + 349. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1998. Paper, £15.99. ISBN: 0-253-21157-3.

Good sourcebooks and anthologies are to be prized, all the more so in Britain where their relative lack of value for the Research Assessment Exercise acts as a discouragement from taking on such projects. H.'s anthology is of the best: a thoughtful selection of fascinating works from various types of popular writing from the first to fourth centuries C.E. It includes the first English translation of the *Sortes Astrampsychi*, a complex handbook of divination featuring ninety-two burning questions ('Will I be caught presently as an adulterer'?') and over 1000 answers. The customer is guided to his answer by a routine of picking numbers. H.'s compelling introduction explains how the book became a folkbook and was reworked by Christian writers (e.g. the question 'Will I be reconciled with my girlfriend' is changed to 'Will I become a bishop?'). The judicious translation of Randall Stewart and Kenneth Morrell omits the most obvious Christian accretions. The introductions to each work pay brief attention to comparative folklore (one of H.'s areas of expertise) and major adaptations of the texts into the Middle Ages, as well as discussing contexts, genres, and manuscript traditions. The range and imagination of the compilation and the generally high standard of translation make this an ideal textbook for a course on Greek popular literature in translation.

The book is organized into four sections, the first and longest of which features popular fiction: Xenophon of Ephesus' novel *An Ephesian Tale*; the anonymous Christian *The Acts of Paul and Thecla*; *Secundus the Silent Philosopher*, an anonymous piece of 'wisdom literature' which dramatizes a conversation between the philosopher and the emperor Hadrian and wherein Secundus tests the assertion that every woman is a whore; Pseudo-Lucian's *Lucius or the Ass*, a biography of Aesop; and Pseudo-Callisthenes' *The Alexander Romance*. Part Two contains 'popular compilations': paradoxography (Phlegon of Tralles' *Book of Marvels*), fables (the *Collectio Augustana*), and jokes (Hierocles and Philagrius' *The Laughter-Lover*). Part Three comprises the oracle book and Part Four selections from gravestone verse representing 'popular literature in public places'. Of the translations, most of which have been published before and are generally excellent, the only one which should not have been included is Moses Hadas's translation of *An Ephesian Tale*. Inaccurate and florid, it fails to capture Xenophon's plain and paratactic prose style. Graham Anderson's translation in B. P. Reardon's *Collected Ancient Greek Novels* (Berkeley, 1989) is far superior.

It will be objected that 'popular literature' and 'light reading' are inaccurate and anachronistic assignations. 'Popular literature' indicates a mass audience, which literacy rates alone precluded. Moreover, the works selected are from very different genres and contexts. H. discusses these issues and bases his characterization on Pierre Bourdieu's formulation of the popular aesthetic, the essence of which is the primacy of content over form. H. argues that ancient Greek popular literaure is characterized by unknown authorship, textual fluidity, and non-organic composition. Much of this is contentious, but does not detract from the very real contribution which this book makes.

Arizona State University HELEN L. MORALES

R. S. KRAEMER: *When Aseneth Met Joseph. A Late Antique Tale of the Biblical Patriarch and His Egyptian Wife, Reconsidered*. Pp. xviii + 365. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998. Cased, £45. ISBN: 0-19-511475-2.

The narrative commonly known as *Joseph and Aseneth* is most likely to have come to the attention of this journal's readers because of its affinities with the Greek novel, though the uncertainties surrounding its date, provenance, and text make it difficult to decide where in the history of the genre it is to be accommodated. There appears at least to be no doubt that it was originally written in Greek, not translated from Hebrew or Aramaic. However, there is substantial disagreement as to which of two textual groups, *b* and *d*, is closer to the original: is *b* an expansion or *d* an abbreviation? (The most recent edition, Philonenko's [1968], is based on a firm preference for *d*.) As regards the more generally interesting questions of its historical context and provenance, it has for some time seemed impossible to say more than that it was probably composed by an Egyptian Jew sometime between the early second century B.C. and the early second century A.D. (The *TLG* opts for the second century A.D., without qualification.)

Developing the approach adopted in an earlier study of this text (see 'The Book of Aseneth' in Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza [ed.], *Searching the Scriptures: a Feminist Commentary* [New York, 1994/London, 1995], pp. 859–88), Ross Kraemer argues against the current consensus. As our guide on a magical, midrashic mystery tour she offers a breathtaking panorama of affinities, associations, and effects of intertextuality; the jacket design, featuring Helios driving his chariot in the late third- or early fourth-century zodiac mosaic from the synagogue at Hammath Tiberias, admirably suggests the perspective in which she views the work. In the end she advocates enhanced agnosticism, holding Christian provenance to be just as likely as Jewish, though these two categories do not exhaust the possibilities. She does not favour a date of composition earlier than the late third century A.D. The most distinctive feature of her interpretation lies in its feminist emphasis, and though her dating rather reduces the novella's interest for students of the Greek novel, her championship should secure it a niche in gender studies.

It is, however, unfortunate that she does not directly address (though she alludes to) another recent study, which comes to quite different conclusions. The ingenious interpretation of Gideon Bohak (Joseph and Aseneth *and the Jewish Temple in Heliopolis* [Atlanta, 1996]) links this narrative to the establishment by Onias IV, in the mid-second century B.C., of a Jewish temple at Heliopolis, in apparent fulfilment of Isaiah's prophecy (19.8–9). The story of Aseneth's conversion thus interpreted is not an imaginative reconstruction of the religious experience of Joseph's destined bride but represents the transformation into a Jewish temple of a site associated with idolatry; the new name bestowed on Aseneth by her supernatural visitant, 'City of Refuge' (15.6), thus corresponds to Ptolemy VI's provision of a safe haven for Onias and his supporters. This radical reorientation thus situates the narrative in the context of an episode which quite soon was better forgotten and certainly at the time needed all the propaganda which could be mustered. Bohak's interpretation accounts for very many acknowledged difficulties, not least the surprising prominence of Pharaoh in the marriage arrangements and the curiously less than blissful sequel (23–9), in which the portrayal of Levi suggests something of the author's ancestry and aspirations.

No one should read one of these studies without reading the other. The gulf between them reminds us that interpretation cannot be divorced from textual criticism. Bohak opts for the *b* recension, Kraemer for *d*. Whatever else is controversial, the attention to detail required by their arguments highlights the acute need for a proper critical edition.

Hertford College, Oxford STEPHANIE WEST

D. BRODKA: *Die Romideologie in der römischen Literatur der Spätantike*. Pp. 273. Berlin, etc.: Peter Lang 1998. Paper, DM 31. ISBN: 3-631-33733-7.

The Latin-speaking, therefore Roman, authors whose opinions are examined in this volume are Pacatus, Ausonius, Symmachus, Ammianus Marcellinus, Claudian, Rutilius Namatianus,

Ambrose, Prudentius, Jerome, Orosius, and Augustine. All wrote in the last years of the fourth or at the beginning of the fifth century—an epoch of Christian tyranny, barbarian depredation, and enforced reform when even the loyalest citizen of the Empire could not look upon its nominal metropolis with the eyes of an Augustus, a Virgil, or even a sophist of more affluent times. Brodka plots three phases in the evolution of Roman ideology up to this point: under the bellicose *pax Augusta* poets proclaimed the supremacy of Italy and her people; in the second century Aelius Aristides (whose value as a witness is not impaired by B.'s exaggeration of his influence) congratulates the subjects on the freedoms that they have purchased from their conquerors; 160 years later Eusebius, the encomiast of Constantine, extolled his global monarchy as the instrument and image of divine omnipotence. Once Constantine had decamped from Rome to the East, city and state were severed irreversibly, and as B. shows, the new cult of the Emperor inspired more concrete and more credible eulogies than the warfare of the period, which even when sporadically successful was defensive, and paled before Rome's ancient feats of arms. Pagans did not cease to venerate the eternal city, though for one at least, Rutilius Namatianus, this faith underwent a 'Spiritualisierung' after Alaric's sack of Rome (p. 126). Claudian, in his panegyrics on rulers and generals, couples poetic assurances of victory with sedulous exhortations to Rome's defenders; in Ausonius (who wrote little for other Christians, but is here declared to be one) Rome does not reach the status of an idea. The city prefect Symmachus, like a second Aristides, maintained that what Rome seized by force she had civilized by her laws; his protégé Augustine, on the other hand, denied that her annexations could be justified, and spoke for many Christians when he urged that the Roman Empire (so conducive to the spread of Christianity) had no merit but as a tool in the hand of God. While therefore it was now impossible to praise the city without some flattery of the Emperor, it was possible to accept the divine commission of the latter while denying the legality and the longevity of his realm.

B.'s reading of the texts is accurate and thorough, though little attempt is made to define the literary character of each author, and therefore the reader is not apprised of the different rôles that factors such as irony, imitation, and magniloquence may have played in their depiction of the capital. The method of allotting a separate chapter to each witness robs the book of its natural centrepiece, the twenty-year debate inspired by Symmachus' petition for the restoration of the Altar of Victory; as it is, the reader must turn back to him to follow up the references in chapters on Prudentius and Ambrose. The omission of the *Historia Augusta* requires defence, as there are excellent, if not conclusive, arguments for dating this caesarian entertainment to the last decade of the fourth century. Above all, one cannot but regret the brief and unilinear treatment of the earlier period in the introduction; Romans seldom took such an unadulterated pride in their success as this implies. Sallust's was not the only pen to trace Rome's moral decline to her material prosperity, and Caesar is not ashamed to put words of pathos and defiance into the mouths of vanquished Gauls. The honour of being the first to say that patriotism is not a virtue falls to the Christian Cicero Lactantius, but 200 years before him, Tacitus had summed up the foreign policy of Rome with the epigram *solitudinem faciunt, pacem vocant*, 'they make a desolation and call it peace'. When Tacitus writes the history of the Principate he produces a manifesto of republican sympathies; and, while B. admits that the concept of the Emperor as the vicar of God was a Christian innovation, he may have underestimated its power to evoke hostility or contempt among the pagans of the recrudescent Senate. Why, for example, is Macrobius absent from this study? No doubt because he had nothing to contribute to the Roman ideology; but when we note the contribution made by his senatorial interlocutors to our knowledge of Roman literature, we may well construe his silence as a judgement on the Christian occupation of the throne. Not only the Greek historian Ammianus Marcellinus, but even Symmachus, prefect and patronus of the city and a character in Macrobius' *Saturnalia*, depicted Rome as an ailing parent, bowed with years and sorrow, and with nothing to plead on his own behalf but the memory of a time when all petitions were commands.

Christ Church, Oxford M. J. EDWARDS

S. MORTON BRAUND, R. MAYER (edd.): *amor: roma Love and Latin Literature. Eleven Essays (and One Poem) by Former Research Students Presented to E. J. Kenney on his Seventy-Fifth Birthday*. (Cambridge Philological Society Supplementary Volume 22.) Pp. 208, 2 ills. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society, 1999. Paper. ISBN: 0-906014-19-0.

One of the pleasures of reading this agreeable collection of essays by Ted Kenney's former research students is the chance to savour different Cambridge voices: 'I have never seen any ox, however thoroughly broken, pulling a plough with any real chirpiness'; 'As a sub-genre, Ovid's spousal elegy is marked above all by a combination of praise and protreptic; in both respects the achieved and desiderated virtue of Ovid's wife is negotiated through a cataloguing of *exempla* of similarly praiseworthy women in mythology'; '*This* interpretation sees the text's "concerns" . . . as precisely issues of unity and separation, of necessary and arbitrary relations, so "naturally" it reads the problems (or should that be problem?) of the poem's unity and addressees in that light, as historically transcendent aspects of its meaning'. None of these voices sounds much like that of Ted Kenney himself, suave, informative, carrying learning lightly; which makes it the more striking that he produced such disparate students. Light is thrown on that matter, no doubt, by his advice to the young Duncan Kennedy: 'Follow the argument wherever it leads'. It was clearly not a case of 'ipse dixit'.

The bibliography of Kenney's writings that completes the volume (besides countless reviews on a marvellous range of topics) reminds us of his abiding interest in Ovid, but also of major work on Lucretius, Apuleius, and the history of classical scholarship. That for me makes it a little sad that this collection is focused as narrowly as it is. Most contributors stick to the last of Love: John Barsby in Terence, Duncan Kennedy in Catullus, Theodore D. Papanghelis in the *Eclogues*, Alan Griffin in the *Metamorphoses*, Stephen Hinds in the *Tristia*. S. J. Heyworth and J. B. Hall, in interestingly contrasting manners, write textual notes on Propertius Book 4 and Ovid's amatory works. But D. W. T. Vessey in a discursive piece moves to the unfamiliar figure of Orontius, while one of the editors, Susanna Morton Braund, felicitously brings in a passion of both Kenneys by analysing 'moments of love' in Monteverdi and Richard Strauss as well as Lucretius and Apuleius. And W. R. Barnes kicks over the traces altogether by arguing for the influence of ancient Homeric commentary on two passages late in the *Aeneid*.

The second editor, Roland Mayer, smuggles love into his title ('Love It or Leave It: Silver Latin Poetry'), but that is the end of it. His contribution is the most accessible and provocative of them all. It concludes resoundingly: 'If we want to understand the Romans through their literature we must be self-effacing and understand that our discipline is at bottom a branch of history. If we, as teachers, fail to do this and persist in vilifying what the Romans admired and achieved, we only justify our students' already considerable lack of interest in Latin literature.' M. has been discussing the varying fortunes of some Latin poets, particularly Lucan and Tibullus, and his assertion is that we should not dismiss lightly writers whom the Romans themselves thought highly of. Housman, cited by M., put the point with customary vigour: 'Our first task is to get rid of [our own tastes], and to acquire, *if we can*, by humility and self-repression, the tastes of the classics' [my italics]. For M., reform will come if we find out what pleased the ancients and then ask why it pleased: 'congeniality to ourselves is neither here nor there'. I find it hard to believe that students will feel much affinity for teachers so humble and so repressed, and I hope that teachers will not don this hair-shirt. I do not think that we could acquire 'the tastes of the classics', or that such an acquisition would be particularly desirable. We are all of our time, and if that means we are sceptical of the merits of Tibullus, so be it. Our pupils will not thank us for pretending, or even persuading ourselves, that what we see as bad is good. Nor do I feel it in the least inconsistent to think (as I do) that Latin is worth teaching but that little written in it is self-evidently superior to things written in various languages since. It is not even as though the Mayer test 'Did it please the ancients?' always came up with an unequivocal answer. Cicero began to lose favour in his own time, and people were still divided about him when the *Dialogus* was written. Was an Aper, biased by the movements and prejudices of his own times, really in so much better a position than we are to judge writers of republican Latin? And if he was not, why can we not have our prejudices too? 'But Aper spoke Latin.' So did many people in the Middle Ages whose opinions on antiquity M. would dismiss. At what point is the line to be drawn?

J. C. McKeown prefaces the book with a long Genethliacon, which ends:

sed tua cur longis merita aequiperare loquelis
experiamur? amor nos scribere iussit, amoris
hoc, precor, accipias pignus multosque per annos
candidior semper Genius celebrandus adesto!

And so say all of us.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford MICHAEL WINTERBOTTOM

P. Haß: *Der locus amoenus in der antiken Literatur: Zu Theorie und Geschichte eines literarischen Motivs*. Pp. 166. Bamberg: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, 1998. Paper. ISBN: 3-927392-66-9.

Serious study of idealized landscape as the literary topos which Cicero first termed *locus amoenus* begins with E. R. Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages* (New York, 1953; English trans. of the German edn of 1948), whose eleven-page sketch (pp. 192–202) opened up a rich area for subsequent research. G. Schönbeck extensively investigated how Curtius's categories could be applied to ancient literature (*Der locus amoenus von Homer bis Horaz*, diss. Heidelberg, 1962). In another dissertation C. E. Newlands expanded the inquiry by examining the parallel development of the *locus amoenus* in painting (and later Christian mosaics) and poetry with the intention of illuminating a changing cultural consciousness; she broadly followed Curtius's program of studying later antiquity (e.g. Ausonius and Venantius Fortunatus) in the light of classical Latin poetry (*The Transformation of the locus amoenus in Roman Poetry*, diss. Berkeley, 1984). Haß's dissertation (Erlangen-Nürnberg, 1998) reacts against Curtius's and Schönbeck's 'normative' method of creating a model and then seeing how each example fits. She embraces instead an 'historical-inductive' methodology which posits that genres and topoi are constructed by a succession of similar texts, after which subsequent texts attach themselves to the established form.

Applying this theory to the *locus amoenus*, H. starts with nine passages from Homer and Hesiod which collectively 'create' the topos in Greek literature: one from the *Iliad* (the *hieros gamos* on Ida in Book 14), seven from the *Odyssey* (the grottoes of Calypso and of the Ithacan nymphs at 13.102–13; Goat Island; Athena's holy grove; Alcinous' garden; the Cyclops' land; and the nymphs' sanctuary at 17.204–12), and one from the *Erga* ('the farmers' picnic', 582–96). These descriptions each offer a landscape which can be grasped as a whole, which contains a selection of various characterizing elements (e.g. trees, flowers, wild or domestic animals, rocks), where one invariably finds water of some sort and a sense of protectiveness, and which gods and men have participated in forming; adjectives in each passage accent the place's wondrous quality. The first chapter points to these shared features in the nine constitutive *loci* and explains how a particular context justifies the lack of certain elements or the addition of others. For instance, the cloud which Zeus and Hera draw around themselves on Mt Ida takes the place of the usual scenic elements suggesting protection. On the other hand, Calypso's cave has also a hearth and loom to emphasize its domestic character.

The long second chapter charts the later history of the nine archaic texts in several literary genres. Here H.'s notion of *imitatio* is extremely elastic. One often questions the genuineness of an alleged filiation but the exercise of reading in the light of the 'model' texts nonetheless helps to clarify aspects of a later *locus amoenus.* Successor texts become part of a series ('Nachfolger-Kette') spun out of each of the Homeric and Hesiodic passages. Some originating passages give rise to more than one motif-chain.

For example, the pleasant location of the summer picnic at *WD* 582–96 (1) is a quiet piece of countryside that one yearns for, as later in Eur. *Hipp.* 208–11, several Hellenistic epigrams, Ov. *Fas*. 3.9–28, et al.; (2) is an idyllic place of relaxation, such as one finds in some later thankful praises of the *rus*; and (3) serves as a background for activities akin to the singing set in bucolic poetry's *locus amoenus.*

The *Zusammenfassung* has two aims. First, to justify the author's definition of *locus amoenus* by showing how ten groups of passages similar to the topos do not really fit it—descriptions of the seasons, for instance, or of the splendors of the countryside. Required are an overview of the landscape in question, the presence of water and the motif of protection, as well as adjectives suggesting the place's wondrous and inviting qualities. (For example, Ov. *Met*. 11.229–40 surveys a pleasant myrtle grotto with a protective cave but the reference to water and the requisite

adjectives are 'weak'.) The concluding chapter secondly considers the degree to which descriptions of a *locus amoenus* are woven into their respective literary contexts. H. concludes that in all literary periods some are closely embedded in the work, while others are not. This general observation counters Curtius's view of a rhetoricized topos whose instances became virtually detachable from their contexts starting, with the virtuoso descriptive performances of Ovid.

University of Virginia JOHN F. MILLER

H. LAUSBERG: *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric. A Foundation for Literary Study* (trans. D. F. Orton and R. D. Anderson). Pp. xxxi + 921. Leiden, Boston, and Cologne: Brill, 1998 (first published in German 1960, 2nd edn 1973). Cased, $240.50. ISBN: 90-04-10705-3.

> To speak of selection is perhaps to misuse the word. Lausberg leaves nothing out. The excess of detail is intolerable and self-defeating . . . In handling the material, Lausberg owes most to Quintilian, the *fullest* of the ancient sources. But the fact of which the reader is inadequately warned is that this is *Lausberg's* 'Art of Rhetoric', and very odd to the classical reader, much of it appears.

Those rather caustic remarks about the first edition of L.'s *Handbuch der Literarischen Rhetorik* come from a review by N. E. Douglas, published in the 1962 *CR* (pp. 246–7). A great deal of thought and scholarship has been contributed to the study of rhetoric in the forty years since that early review was written. Ancient rhetoric has enjoyed a renaissance in contemporary poetics, theory of literature, and cultural studies, among writers as diverse as Wayne Booth and Michel Foucault. Roland Barthes published an *aide-mémoire* to ancient rhetoric in the 1960s and Nietzsche's lectures on the subject have recently been translated. More strictly within the realm of classical studies, many leading scholars including George Kennedy and Donald Russell have done much to put the history of rhetoric and the study of individual rhetorical texts on a more secure footing.

It is telling that this revival of interest has been favourable to L.'s handbook, which has become a standard reference tool: *de facto*, its utility hardly needs to be defended. A contemporary perspective provides some answers to Douglas's criticisms quoted above—criticisms which this review will attempt to meet because they could still resurface from some quarters. First, there now seems to be little basis for objecting to the great number and detail of sources in the work. Researchers in Latin and Greek literature who are working properly should always use compendious works of reference. Indeed, for a number of recent studies of the rhetorization of ancient literature to have come about, the kind of comprehensiveness and breadth offered by L. is clearly indispensable. For example, G. B. Conte's *The Rhetoric of Imitation* (Ithaca, 1986) and A. J. Woodman's *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography* (London, 1988)—studies as important and influential as they are divergent—rely on *detailed* knowledge of tropes and figures (and competing testimonies about them), and not merely on some general ideas of what rhetoric was like.

A claim that L.'s collection is too individualistic in conception would only hold if one could find an *ars rhetorica* which was not somehow idiosyncratic. The response to that claim does not only have to rest on principles of anti-foundationalism which are currently in favour. One could also appeal to historicist common sense: everyone who has ever written a rhetorical manual, from Quintilian to Puttenham, will be aware of how rhetoric works, and will be, to a greater or lesser extent, a rhetorician himself. It is a characteristic of rhetoricians (as it is of all kinds of teachers) to present personal perspectives as *the* perspectives, to present independent opinions as official demonstrations. At least, with the encyclopedic scope of this *Handbook*, L. shows all the hidden plumbing—and it would be hard to see what L. would have had to gain by deliberately seeking to appropriate and personally customize the art/science of rhetoric.

Finally, Douglas's impression that L.'s collection appears 'very odd to the classical reader' is grounded on the depressing assumption that a classical reader should be confined not only to classical texts, but to *ancient* classical texts. L.'s study includes coverage of rhetoric in the medieval and modern periods, with a 300 page of index of rhetorical terms in French, as well as of those in Latin and Greek. Surely part of the point of reading ancient literature is to acquire a better understanding of later literatures: the range of testimonia collected by L. (who was a pupil

of E. R. Curtius) provides abundant proof of the vital and central rôle of classical rhetoric for the Western literary tradition as a whole. And this *Handbook* is more than a glossary of technical terms purely within rhetoric: the last sections of the study (pp. 504–94) are devoted to poetics, whilst the earliest parts examine definitions and conceptions of rhetoric, placing it in relation to grammar, philosophy, and the *artes liberales* as a whole. L. did not by any means intend to offer a historical study, but scrutiny of the various entries contained in this book will provide considerable insight into the evolution of humanistic education.

University of Warwick ANDREW LAIRD

P. Rollinson, R. Geckle: *A Guide to Classical Rhetoric*. Pp. xxx + 179. Signal Mountain, TN: Summertown, 1998. Cased, $29.95. ISBN: 1-893009-01-7.

A handbook concisely introducing the classical rhetoricians seems a good idea; unfortunately, this book does not do the job well. An introduction provides a brief but unreliable historical overview. The development of 'the acute need for oratorical powers' (p. xiii) is explained by contrasting Homeric society and the classical *polis*; the account of the latter gives the mistaken impression that democracy was normal in the *polis*, and concludes with the remarkable assertion that 'over much of the Greek world . . . came the demand for education for all [*sic*!] free men in gaining and perfecting argumentative and persuasive skills with words' (p. xiv). No hint is given that skill with words was already a key element of a young man's training in Homer (*Iliad* 9.442f.). The history of rhetorical theory that follows is also misleading in detail. Consider p. xxi, where the statements that Hermagoras' *staseis* 'were universally adopted' and that 'there are four of them' sandwich a list of treatments of *stasis* that includes the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (which only recognizes three *staseis*), Quintilian (who surveys systems with up to eight), Hermogenes (with thirteen), and Menander Rhetor (the works on epideictic make no reference to *stasis* at all: the claim that Menander 'applies the issues to epideictic rhetoric' is simply and utterly wrong).

The bulk of the book comprises thirty short chapters summarizing the works of major rhetoricians. The aim is 'to provide comprehensive information about ancient rhetorical theory in the form of highly detailed descriptive summaries of all the important authorities and works from Greek and Latin antiquity' (p. vi). 'All' is a bit of a stretch: Hermagoras is omitted (the loss of his works is not a sufficient explanation: Corax and Tisias have a chapter), and so is Sopater. 'Highly detailed' is even more of a stretch: Quintilian is covered in fifteen pages. But the major flaw is that these epitomes are *too* detailed for the space available. At times the desire to stuff in detail means that the summaries are compressed to the point of unintelligibility; I defy anyone who is not already well acquainted with Hermogenes' *On Issues* to figure out the profoundly muddled paragraph at the bottom of p. 70. But even when this pitfall is avoided the summaries make no attempt to help the reader make sense of the material: bald lists of technical terms and precepts without context or rationale do nothing to advance understanding—which, surely, is what a 'guide' should do.

The collection of *Rhetores Graeci* curiously attributed here to an editor named 'Leonardi Spengel' (*passim*) is occasionally cited where more recent editions have superseded it: Schmid's text of pseudo-Aristides and Felten's of Nicolaus should have been mentioned. But in general the bibliographical references are commendably up to date: Dilts and Kennedy are cited for the Anonymus Seguerianus and Apsines, and Patillon for Theon. It is a strong sign of the increasing vigour of this field that supplements are already needed: note, in particular, the translation of pseudo-Aristides in Rutherford's *Canons of Style* (Oxford, 1998). I have recently expressed doubts about Apsines' authorship of the treatise traditionally ascribed to him (*AJP* 119 [1998], 89–111); pedantry compels me to point out that his ethnic is no guarantee that he was actually *born* in Gadara (p. 13).

University of Leeds MALCOLM HEATH

C. QUESTA: *Il ratto dal serraglio. Euripide, Plauto, Mozart, Rossini*. Pp. 211. Urbino: Quattro Venti, 1997. Paper. ISBN: 88-392-0441-5.

The punning cover illustration of this delectable book prepares one for the engaging pages that follow. Questa's devotion to the lyric stage in all its forms is well known, and this essay, first published over twenty years ago and now revised with the addition of a programme note for a La Scala production of Gluck's *Iphigénie en Tauride*, has lost none of its freshness, indeed tartness. Wagner and Germans generally (pp. 63, 115, and n. 95), Normalisti from Pisa (p. 153 n. *), and even A. M. Dale (described as 'inamena' on p. 11) are among those sideswiped. Bouquets, on the other hand, are awarded to Maria Callas (n. 70) and Samuel Ramey (nn. 138 and 141). This is all good fun, and of the highest urbanity. But what is at issue?

The Scala programme note provides the most accessible account. Q. can demonstrate that there underlies two tragedies by Euripides, some later Greek comedies, and operas by Mozart and Rossini an identical story line: all entail rescue by ruse. We are, if I mistake not, back in structuralist territory once again, and no great harm in that. But an aesthete may be inclined to shrug weary shoulders, as much as to say, 'So what?'. You see, the plot may be essentially identical in *Iphigenia in Tauris* and in *The Italian Girl in Algiers*, but one is a tragedy and the other a comedy (Q. faces this issue, of course). The bare plot had no control over the treatment accorded it; even within the same dramatic genre, Euripides could give a cheerful end to the *Helen*, but the *Iphigenia* is altogether darker, though their plots are much the same. Now Q. himself was never blind to the determining rôle of management. He noted, for instance, that one representative of this same plot is the Chariton mime, the text of which can be found in D. L. Page's indispensable Loeb volume, *Select Papyri III (Literary Papyri Poetry)*, pp. 337–49. Q. is not thrilled with the mime as literature; Page called it a 'low sort of music-hall performance'. The plot thus seems quite immaterial to the quality of the end product. And here we are dealing with a product chiefly determined by its genre, mime. Q. tries not to underrate the grip of genre (see p. 101), but I still feel it counts for far more than he allows: in the *Iphigenia* Euripides spends ages over the recognition scene, which Gluck cut to the bone, as David West noted in his programme note for a shattering Welsh National Opera production of that masterpiece. Gluck knew that 300 lines of stichomythia would never do in music, and so the emotional and dramatic weight of the two tragedies is differently balanced. Structuralism never accounted for that sort of thing, or for quality (which depends on the artist), or for tone (which depends on the genre); it was not designed to, given that in its origins it dealt largely with traditional tales, not works of consummate art.

In a way this book struck me as something of a lament for the loss of the great dramatic tradition which fed the lyric and dramatic stages of Europe for so many centuries. The plot as laid bare by Q. was strong and appealing, and wonderfully adaptable over several millennia. He seems to be regretting its passing as an inspiration for playwrights. As a history of the use of a particular plot, this book is a minor masterpiece, and I warmly recommend it. Even when Q. misfires—of course, Tamino and Pamina do *not* have lots of children (p. 87), breeding is for the 'low' Papageno and Papagena; Strauss's re-working of Mozart's *Idomeneo* was no sacrilege (p. 159 n. 4) and (I speak as one who heard it last year in the Barbican Hall in London) even has something to recommend it—even Q.'s misapprehensions underscore the lively, informed, and personal response that alone makes literary analysis worthwhile.

King's College London ROLAND MAYER

E. FLORES: *Elementi critici di critica del testo ed epistemologia*. Pp. 107. Naples: Loffredo, 1998. Paper, L. 22,600. ISBN: 88-8096-564-6.

A circumloquacious title for a book which wends a prolix path through some logical and conceptual problems associated with the editing of texts. I say 'editing of texts', because Flores deals with only one side (the mechanical side) of what might properly be called 'critica del testo'. He questions the entitlement of a reading to be called *facilior* or *difficilior*, and of an error to be called 'significant'. He claims, more than once, that textual criticism is prone to *petitio principii* or to treading in vicious circles, as, for example, when it attempts to establish a text by reference to the author's *usus scribendi*, which can itself be established only by reference to the text which is being established. Such claims of circularity are old hat: for suitable comment see E. J. Kenney, *The Classical Text* (Berkeley, 1974), pp. 126, 134–6, M. D. Reeve,

OCD[3], p. 1490. The second part of the book, while still awash with theorrhoea, has more substance. It is an attack on stemmatics, and in particular on the notion of datable archetypes of the Lachmannian and Maasian kind. The attack is conducted on parochial ground: the literature cited and the stemmata targeted are mostly Italian. To what extent, on what terms, and with what success the debate on such issues has been conducted outside Italy goes unacknowledged. There is an appendix, with no obvious relevance to what has preceded, listing a few 'unconscious' errors in Latin texts, allegedly prompted by a copyist's religious or sexual obsessions. Innocent scholars may prefer to associate the corruption of *O colonia* at Cat. 17.1 with *oculus* rather than with *culus.* At Cat. 68.116 F. has rightly interpreted the compendia in O as *heb'r* (*r* is certain; *hebe et*, read by D. F. S. Thomson, is wrong), but his uncompromising pronouncement ('è chiaro che . . .') that this is the remnant of an obscene gloss *Hebes rima* is risible. Finally, why is Housman's 1921 lecture cited from Carter's *Selected Prose*?

Queens' College, Cambridge JAMES DIGGLE

C. NICOLAS: *Utraque Lingua. Le calque sémantique: domaine gréco-latin* (Bibliothèque d'Études Classiques). Pp. 301. Louvain and Paris: Éditions Peeters, 1996. Belg. frs. 1500. ISBN: 90-6831-889-6 (Belgium), 2-87723-311-1 (France).

The term 'semantic calque' refers to what is often in English called a 'loan-translation'. An existing word acquires a new sense based on the meaning of a word in another language perceived as corresponding to it in form or in basic meaning. An example often given is the use of French 'réaliser' in the sense of English 'realize', i.e. become conscious of a fact, a sense which the French word did not previously possess. The process often took place between Greek and Latin; Latinists are familiar with many instances in which Latin words acquired a new dimension to their meaning as a result of contact with Greek, especially in the area of philosophical and technical discourse and, later, in the special vocabulary of Christianity.

The book under review offers (Part I) a general introduction analysing in painstaking fashion the different possible types of calque, making some fine distinctions among them, and offering a method of semantic analysis which purports to clarify the process whereby the meaning of a word in one language is extended or changed under the influence of its counterpart in another language. Part II contains particular studies of a number of areas of Latin and Greek vocabulary, which I list here: (grammar) *casus* πτῶσις, (philosophy) *natura* φύσις, *ratio* λόγος, *causa* αἰτία, (Christianity) *gratia* χάρις, *passio transitus pascha* πάσχειν διάβασις, (ethics) *intemperantia* ἀκρασία, and appropriately for the last chapter, *finis* τέλος.

The material of Part II, though fascinating in itself, is in most cases well known, although I must acknowledge that N.'s treatment has made me much more aware of the problems surrounding *intemperantia* (*tempero* means both 'control' and 'mix', so that *intemperantia* can reflect both ἀκρασία 'lack of self-control' and ἀκρᾱσία 'lack of balance between the elements of a mixture'). As a set of case studies, this part of the book is detailed and methodical, and offers a useful synthesis of material. There is still work to be done: a wider range of examples would enable us to see more clearly the extent of the phenomenon and its distribution across different historical periods and areas of discourse. N.'s distinctive contribution lies rather in the semantic analysis; the book—whose plan and style suggest all too strongly the doctoral thesis 'dont ce livre est l'écho'—is in effect an experiment in applying these methods to a selection of Latin and Greek material. This aspect, I have to say, may well seem forbidding to the non-initiate. The text is sprinkled with formulae such as '$\Sigma^2 = \Sigma^1 \wedge$ s.2.2., $\Sigma^2 \Rightarrow \Sigma^1$ . . .' (this example is on p. 97), which may be illuminating for those of a mathematical turn of mind, but are likely to leave others gasping; more accessible are the diagrams illustrating semantic change, although they too are often complex. However, as far as I can see, the symbols and diagrams do not seem to be altogether necessary for the understanding of the exposition and argument, provided one keeps one's wits about one.

Not being an expert in the general theory of semantics, I find it difficult to assess the author's contribution on that front, but the book may at least serve the purpose of making the Latin and Greek material available to those engaged in that field (they would, however, have to know Latin and Greek in order to follow it). Of classicists, those most likely to consult it will be those doing

specialized research on texts containing the particular lexical items in question. The bibliography, particularly as regards work published in French, is full and useful.

University of Newcastle upon Tyne J. G. F. POWELL

F. W. Alonso: *La fortaleza asediada. Diosas, héroes y mujeres poderosas en el mito griego*. Pp. 357. Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca, 1997. Paper. ISBN: 84-7481-883-4.

This book takes as its premise the idea that analysis of gender relations can be used as an explanatory model for the whole body of Greek mythology. To be more accurate, it identifies hierarchy as the most substantial and most basic theme of Greek myths, but approaches the question of hierarchy from the perspective of the battle of the sexes. Alonso takes us on a detailed journey through the mythic material of the epics (both extant and lost), with particular attention to the *Odyssey*, in order to illustrate this point.

He describes his method as the formulation of hypotheses through the reading of individual myths, which must then be tested by checking them against the supporting evidence, that is, 'a sufficient quantity and quality of myths'. The specifics of gender relations in Greek myths shed light on the nature of Greek myth as a body, while a global perspective leads inevitably to the examination of hierarchies and brings us back to gender. The dangers of circularity in this type of reasoning are obvious, but since we have a limited body of evidence, they are to some degree unavoidable. To his basic comparative method he adds insights drawn primarily from anthropology and women's studies.

At the core of the book is the recognition that myths provide a necessary forum for the exploration and questioning of social norms. Greek mythology is characterized by the violation of certain basic assumptions: that the gods' superiority necessitates unbridgeable gaps between the divine and human states, and that males are dominant over females. The heroic epoch represents a temporary period of human history before which these hierarchies had become fixed, an age of god–human intercourse and hybrid offspring. It is in the relationships between heroes and goddesses or powerful women that we can best see the rôle of myth in articulating the male anxiety that comes as a necessary concomitant of power.

A. devotes the first and third chapters to a discussion of his type case, the relationship between Odysseus and his divine paramours, Calypso and Circe. The intervening chapter is given to a discussion of his methods. Subsequent chapters deal with various manifestations of the powerful female, exploring the relationships between Anchises and Aphrodite, Pasiphae and Minos, Omphale and Herakles, Thetis and Achilles, and many others. Chapter IX discusses the end of the heroic epoch in the Theban and Trojan wars, presenting the entire matter of Greek heroic myth as a sort of supermyth in which initial experimentation with hierarchy is resolved through a final solution which forever establishes by divine will the order of things.

The author is perhaps overambitious in attempting to use one comprehensive principle to explain not only the full corpus of Greek mythology, but also many rituals and the relationship between myth and history (e.g. how the historical fall of the Mycenaean civilization pertains to the end of the mythic age of heroes). Another problem is his assumption that Greek mythology expresses an exclusively male perspective; no female voice is to be heard. The work is characterized by a very dense, convoluted prose style which I am told is difficult even for the native reader of Spanish. Taken as a whole, however, this is a valuable work with many pockets of interesting detail (the discussion of the mutual sexual embarrassments of Pasiphae and Minos is particularly original) and an important thesis.

I would like to thank Sarah Butler for her help with translation.

Kent State University JENNIFER LARSON

J. M. Blázquez: *Intelectuales, ascetas y demonios al final de la Antigüedad*. Pp. 566. Madrid: Ediciones Cátedra, 1998. Paper, no price given. ISBN: 84-376-1499-6.

This volume is in fact a collection of eighteen articles, all previously published in Spain or Italy.

They are grouped into six categories, two of which only contain one item. The demons of the title only feature in the final article. Compilations of articles always run the danger of overlap or having parts which sit uneasily with one another. This is the case here, where the pieces dealing with Clement (four items), Jerome (two items), and Melania the Younger (six items) would have profited from the material being redrafted into a single, more coherent form. Several of the pieces show a tendency to digress from the subject in hand into a general discussion of Late Antiquity. This problem also occurs with the footnotes, which are often copious in detail, but ill-focused. B. shows knowledge of a great deal of ancient source material, but does not always put it to critical use. While he is right to insist that Christian texts are an under-used source for ancient social *mores*, there is little recognition that Christian rhetoric might draw an exaggerated picture of the vices of its day. B. asserts (p. 164) that Clement's picture of Alexandria is a realistic one, but does little to defend this awkward position. The dangers here are clear, particularly when Clement deals with female luxury, a topos of the Christian apologist. Similar use is made of Jerome. Here B. uses the fact that Jerome's writings make similar points to those of fellow-Christian apologist Salvian of Marseilles to argue that his picture is essentially an accurate record of the life of his day. Such arguments are methodologically unsound and simply beg the question. This *naïveté* is also present in B.'s use of pagan sources, where, for example, *SHA*'s *Life of Elagabalus* is used as an unproblematic account of this emperor and his court's behaviour. The *Satyricon* is cited in an equally uncritical fashion. Other errors are also present. On p. 139 B. asserts that Rome did not reject homosexual practices 'until the third century' (presumably A.D.). This shows no knowledge of the republican *Lex Scantinia* or other earlier evidence which is conveniently listed in O. F. Robinson, *The Criminal Law of Ancient Rome* (London, 1995), pp. 70f. There is also a tendency to list rather than discuss the evidence. The first article on the pagan reaction to Christianity looks at the rhetoric used on both sides of the argument, but fails to consider the degree of engagement between the two in any depth. Only one page in a twenty-four page article is spent on Celsus, whom one might expect to be at the centre of such a piece, and the emperor Julian is relegated to a paragraph. The writings of Christian apologists are used to determine popular pagan beliefs about Christianity. This again surely begs an important methodological question which B. ignores.

When dealing with monks, B. draws an extremely polemical dichotomy between the 'decaffeinated' (*sic*) official church on the one hand and ascetics whom he wishes to see as rejecting Classical culture in its entirety on the other. While again there is much material listed, there is no engagement with the view that asceticism was itself a facet of pagan culture, or examination of what made Christian asceticism distinct from that practised by contemporary pagans. B. also refers to the 'servility' of bishops towards secular power in the post-Constantinian church. While it is true that some bishops may have been self-serving, this cannot be said of the likes of Ambrose. Nor can the two groups in the Church be divided so neatly as B. would have us believe. St Martin of Tours is depicted as a successful bishop and ascetic, something equally true of Masona of Merida. Basil of Caesarea is among many who espoused asceticism and yet were pillars of the established Church order. In general it is better to see the quarrel in early Christianity not as between ascetics and the Church, but between the Church, including ascetic communities, and individual hermits operating outside its parameters.

In short, this volume provides a mine of material, but its use and presentation leave something to be desired.

University of Keele A. T. FEAR

B. Bravo: *Pannychis e simposio. Feste private notturne di donne e uomini nei testi letterari e nel culto*. Pp. 140, 7 ills. Pisa and Rome: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionale, 1997. Paper. ISBN: 88-8147- 007-1.

Bravo's short study is an extremely useful one and covers several aspects of private nocturnal cult activity in ancient Greece. He begins with an introduction which looks at Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Antiq. Rom.* 2.19.2: διαπαννυχισμοὺς ἐν ἱεροῖς ἀνδρῶν σὺν γυναιξίν (one of the differences between Greek and Roman religion is that the Greeks had night festivals—pannychides—in which men and women worshipped together in the sacred places;

introduction, pp. 11–14). B. then moves on to the nocturnal festival in Menander's *Dyskolos* (Chapter I, pp. 15–24), and some fragmentary material (Critias, and Anacreon) and the Anthesteria (Chapter II, pp. 25–42). The third and longest chapter (pp. 43–99; nearly half the book) is on *P. Berol.* 270 (Page *PMG* 917, *Select Papyri* III, pp. 388–91). The pannychis of Callimachus (Pfeiffer F227) and the Theoxenia (Chapter IV, pp. 101–17) are then dealt with, and finally there is a brief Chapter V (pp. 119–22) on pannychis and symposium. B. has therefore chosen to cover some interesting—and neglected—material, but it is the treatment of *P. Berol.* 270 which is the most detailed and important part of this work, connecting it, as he does, with a pannychis. There is a Greek text and important commentary on readings at pp. 73–81, with a translation on pp. 82–3.

In addition to these chapters by B., there is an iconographic study by F. Frontisi-Ducroux on the so-called 'Lenaia vases' (pp. 123–32), with some plates of the more familiar of these red-figure pieces, particularly Stamnos Rome Villa [Giulia] 983 [*ARV*^{2} 621.33] and Stamnos Naples [H]2419 [*ARV*^{2} 1151.2], the latter with its rather active women devotees with a tympanon, thyrsos, and torches, and with a woman (perhaps the basilinna, wife of the basileus archon) drawing wine from a stamnos on a table standing before a mask of Dionysos attached to a pillar. In many ways, this chapter is a summary of Frontisi-Ducroux's, *Le dieu-masque. Une figure du Dionysos d'Athènes* (Paris, 1991), and the vases referred to here are numbered according to her catologue in that extremely useful publication, to which Frontisi-Ducroux usefully adds (p. 126 n. 4) some further material. Traditionally associated with the Lenaia, these vases more naturally belong to the Anthesteria, a nocturnal festival (at least many of the women shown in scenes with Dionysos' mask carry torches) and a rite of the *polis*.

One wonders whether 'Pannychis' in B.'s title implied that something in detail might be said about pannychides—nocturnal rites—which were the responsibility of the state, such as the cult of Bendis (*IG* I^3 136, 383, II^2 1283, 1496; the famous opening of Plato's *Republic*), or pannychides in other cities. The book has no abbreviations list or consolidated bibliography; there is, however, a list of ancient sources cited. This is a useful work on nocturnal cultic activity and deserves to be read, especially for bringing some overlooked material to the attention of the reader.

University of New England, Armidale MATTHEW P. J. DILLON

A. Charles-Saget (ed.): *Retour, repentir et constitution de soi*. Pp. 274. Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1998. Paper, frs. 168. ISBN: 2-7116-1355-0.

This collection of short papers comes from the A. J. Festugière Centre at Paris X-Nanterre. It has a promising and appropriate central theme: return and conversion, turning back and turning away, turning to what one was or to what one should be. Hebrew *shuv* is turning back to God, making a fresh start after departing from the covenant. Greek gods do not make covenants, and the Septuagint uses *metanoia* or *epistrephein* to translate *shuv* and cognate words. In later Platonism *epistrophê* is the turning back of derived being to its source. This turning reconstitutes the self which has been dissipated in the concerns of the material world. C.-S. offers an introductory discussion of these concepts, and the different underlying senses of self, in Hebrew, Greek, and early Christian texts, and reflects on what a late Platonist understanding of self might mean in our own century. Three sections on Biblical, early Christian, and Greek concepts are followed by one on twentieth-century reworking of these themes, and the collection ends with Nemesius of Emesa *De natura hominis* 1.3–16.10 in French translation. There are sixteen papers. The only two not in French, Henry Blumenthal on the individual soul in Plotinus and John Dillon on procession and return in Damascius, also appear in other collections, but are relevant here.

In the Biblical section, H. Rouillard-Bonraisin surveys Hebrew usage and C. Aslanoff (who uses a different transliteration) considers the modifications of meaning imported by Septuagint use of *epistrephein*, *apostrephein*, and *metanoia*. The early Christian section offers samples rather than a survey. J.-D. Dubois writes on Valentinian Gnostic texts which associate the penitent soul with Odysseus and with Helen weeping for return home. G. Stroumsa traces, with special reference to Tertullian *De paenitentia*, the development from repentance and baptism in the New Testament to systems of post-baptismal penitence. A paper on Augustine's *cogito* and Descartes, by M.-A.Vannier, proves to be about the constitution of the self as subject.

The Greek section is central. It is a sequence of interrelated papers on late Platonist texts. P. Aubin S. J. contrasts the three hypostases in Plotinus, a descending hierarchy, with the non-hierarchical hypostases of third- and fourth-century Trinitarian theology. In Plotinus, each level of being turns back (*epistrophê*) towards its source; in Christian theology, creatures have come from, and will return to, their creator. H. Blumenthal discusses, in the lively and even amused style characteristic of his last papers, Plotinus on the One, intellect, Soul, and individual souls; he asks to what the individual soul returns, and what happens before and after its embodiment. J. Carlier offers a careful discussion of Porphyry *De regressu animae* (and related texts) on the soul's escape from the cycle of birth, Porphyry's position on the transmigration of the soul to animals or even plants, and what follows about the essence of the soul. What did Porphyry make of Circe's pigs? C. Steel writes on Proclus, who provides the concept of a self-constituting (*authupostatos*) entity, and John Dillon on the critique offered by Damascius. Both deal lucidly and elegantly with the questions presented by the Platonist scheme of remaining/procession/return. If it is return (*epistrophê*) that constitutes the self, does return cancel out procession, and would it not have been better to remain? Dillon interestingly compares with self-constitution the concept of 'emergence', either of life or of consciousness, deployed in modern physics.

The section on 'reprises contemporaines' offers two papers (by M. de Launay and B. Dupuy) on two writers of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, Hermann Cohen and Franz Rosenzweig, and two (by D. Bourel and S. Trigano) on the uses of the theme *teshuvah* in this period. C.-S. reports a conversation with S. Khorouji on the continuing Orthodox tradition of hesychasm, its relationship with late Platonism, and the differences between *epistrophê* and conversion. V. Bibikhine discusses how the poet V. Ivanov interprets Plutarch on the E at Delphi. Finally, the translation from Nemesius, bishop of Emesa in the late fourth century, returns us to the relationship of soul and body in Greek philosophical and Hebrew scriptural tradition. When Nemesius surveys distinctively human characteristics, the two at the head of his list are obtaining forgiveness when we repent, and a body that is mortal but becomes immortal. Man is a penitent animal: a helpful parting thought.

University of Liverpool GILLIAN CLARK

J. LINDERSKI: *Roman Questions: Selected Papers.* (HABES 20.) Pp. xv + 746. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1995. ISBN: 3-515-06677-2.

This book is a collection of sixty-four articles and reviews published by Jerzy Linderski, the Paddison Professor of Latin at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, from 1958 to 1993. It must be said at the outset that it is not, visually, an attractive book. Although very well produced, the pieces it contains are almost all reprinted in their original formats, and the consequent motley of fonts and layouts is at first rather off-putting. Yet as Plato's Alcibiades said of Socrates, the ungainly exterior conceals a wealth of beauty within. Those who are already fans of L. will have a good idea of what it contains and will need no encouragement to read it; others may need some prodding.

The papers are all in English, with the exception of six in German (nos 14–17, 42, and 47) and one short note in Latin (no. 26). They constitute the bulk of L.'s work, apart from two Polish monographs published in 1961 and 1966, on *collegia* and electoral assemblies respectively, and his definitive study of Roman augury in *ANRW* 2.16.3 (1986). The papers retain the numbering of the original publication, with continuous numbering added at the bottom of the page. Although only two of the earliest pieces were revised for this republication, they have all been updated by means of nearly fifty pages of 'addenda and corrigenda' at the back, keyed to the new pagination of the book. In addition, nearly seventy pages of indices (modern authors, ancient sources, and general) facilitate ease of reference. The author has organized the papers not chronologically but thematically, under the rubrics 'historia' (nos 1–4), 'ius publicum' (nos 5–14), 'collegia' (nos 15–17), 'prosopographica' (nos 18–30), 'auctores' (nos 31–35), 'epigraphica' (nos 36–41), 'lexicographica et onomastica' (nos 42–46), and, last but certainly not least, 'religio' (nos 47–64). There is surprising range here: the subjects range from the background and approaches of Mommsen, Holleaux, and Tenney Frank in their interpretations of defensive imperialism (no. 1) to the geographical information found in Alfred the Great's translation of Orosius (no. 35) and to emendations in the text of Martianus Capella (no. 59). But the weight of the book lies in the late Republic, and with questions of constitutional and religious law.

These are not areas of research that are currently fashionable. Nor is L.'s style of *wissenschaftlich* scholarship much in vogue: its hallmarks are a meticulous attention to detail and a mastery of all pertinent materials, both primary sources and secondary discussions. With regard to the latter, L. casts his net wide, and deplores in particular 'the fashionable disease' of neglecting older scholarship (p. 286); he several times points out that allegedly new ideas sometimes go back several centuries (e.g. p. 345). Most of the papers in the book are relatively brief and deal with apparently quite particular points, e.g. Bibulus' postponement of the consular elections in 59 B.C. (no. 5), or the dramatic date of Book 3 of Varro's *De Re Rustica* (no. 8). All this may seem off-putting, and many of the papers can indeed be slow going; not that they lack clarity or wit (L. has both qualities in abundance), but they often require the reader to be as patient and careful as the author. The rewards, however, are ample.

L.'s work is a vivid demonstration that Details Matter, an old moral that is somewhat in danger of being lost in the rush to incorporate new approaches in the study of Graeco-Roman antiquity. Bibulus' postponement of the elections, for example, leads to the conclusion that he, not Caesar, was *consul prior*; this in turn both entails a readjustment in ideas about the workings of politics in 59 B.C. and provides another example of the way that historical sources, in this case consular lists, could be rewritten to suit later generations' views of history. Similarly, the detailed analysis of the evidence for the 'secret books' of the augurs (no. 50) turns out to have significant implications for understanding religious authority in the Roman tradition. These examples could be multiplied, but those interested can easily do this for themselves. Anyone whose work bears on late Republican Rome, or on broader questions of Roman public law and religion, would be well advised to examine these studies and see what L. has to say on the topic: the results will richly repay the effort.

York University, Toronto J. B. RIVES

A. MASTROCINQUE: *Studi sul Mitraismo (il Mitraismo e la Magia)*. Pp. x + 168, 21 ills. Rome: Giorgio Bretschneider, 1998. Paper, L. 270,000. ISBN: 88-7689-0000-0.

Mastrocinque, well known as an editor and academic organizer, presides over a grand project, the description and publication of all the 'gnostic' or 'magical' gems other than those in the major collections, mainly in Northern Europe and the German-speaking lands, which have already been published or are currently in the press (the catalogue of the British Museum collection, largely prepared by the late Morton Smith and now completed by Simone Michel, a pupil of P. Zazoff in Hamburg, is due to appear in 2001). To this end, he has formed an international committee, and organized two conferences in Verona. The first volume of the *Corpus Gemmarum Gnosticarum*, devoted to the older dactyliothecae and publications prior to 1900, will shortly be complete; the second will publish those in the Borgia collection; still others are planned, all to appear as supplements to the *Bolletino di Numismatica*.

The present book is indeed related to this archaeological project, but also the first instalment of a proposed revaluation of the relation between the religions of the Roman Empire on the one hand, including the cult of Isis, Gnosticism, and Judaism, and magic on the other. Readers of M.'s book on Romulus, *Romolo, la fondazione di Roma tra storia e leggenda* (Este, 1993), will know that he is no stranger to daring ideas. Formally, *Studi sul Mitraismo* is likewise a loosely linked series of interpretations of objects, with an overall hypothesis. It might fairly be characterized as a sustained reflection on the graffito *N]ama/Maximus/magus* (CIMRM no. 61) from the mithraeum at Dura-Europos. In sharp distinction to the current fashion for regarding Mithraism as an astrolatry, M. sees both it and the 'magical Esperanto' of the Empire as common products of the Zoroastrian pseudepigrapha, as set out by Jean Bidez and Franz Cumont in *Les mages hellénisés* (1938). If we cannot know exactly how Mithraism came into being, we can say that its founder must have been a Hellenized Magus, not in Cumont's sense of a *magousaios* (a Greek-speaking Mazdean priest), but in the sense of a master of the Zoroastrian pseudepigrapha, somebody capable of mediating this complex of 'wisdom' to the Roman world, perhaps even the author of some of the works of 'Ostanes'. If we have to point to a location, the Samothracian mysteries may have provided a key crossing-point between Iran and Hellenism: Samothrake was sacked by the Mithras-worshipping pirates in the Mithradatic War (App. *Mithr.* 63). The Mithraic gems studied in this book are thus expressions of a Mithraism rather different

from that normally envisaged, a cult also involving 'magical' practice, divination, healing, thaumaturgy—the gamut of Persian wisdom in fact.

The thesis is attractively argued, but skates over sheets of thin ice. M. believes, for example, that Plutarch's dualistic version of Persian religion (*De Iside* 46–7) is compatible with Mithraism as known archaeologically—but has to turn Areimanius into an Osiris to achieve this feat (pp. 86–91). At bottom, one must decide how to take the 'magical' gems claimed as Mithraic. I myself incline rather to the traditional view of Armand Delatte and Campbell Bonner, that Mithras here is simply an aspect of solar syncretism. Nevertheless, M.'s decision to take the Zoroastrian pseudepigrapha seriously in considering the origins of Mithraism is very welcome and well worth pursuing, albeit in a different form. And on a more technical level, he makes a valuable attempt to come to grips with *charakteres*, the non-standard writing of Graeco-Egyptian magical texts (pp. 73–80). A lively, quirky book.

Ilmmünster RICHARD GORDON

R. Riesner, D. Stott (trans.): *Paul's Early Period. Chronology, Mission Strategy, Theology*. Pp. xvi + 535. Grand Rapids, MI and Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans, 1998. Paper, $50. ISBN: 0-8028-4166-X.

This translation of *Die Frühzeit des Apostels Paulus*, which appeared in 1994, includes some minor additions, such as reference to literature which has appeared since the German original was completed. One minor drawback is that the author index is not as comprehensive as in the original.

From 1905 when the Gallio-inscription was published until 1980, a relative consensus had emerged regarding Pauline chronology. But since 1980, a number of quite divergent chronologies have been proposed and it is no exaggeration to say that the field has been in some chaos. For example, G. Lüdemann put forward a controversial chronology of Paul based mainly on the letters and largely independent of the Acts of the Apostles. He argued for a mission in Greece from around A.D. 36 (i.e. before the Jerusalem council, not after as in Acts) and dated Claudius' edict expelling the Jews from Rome to A.D. 41. R. engages with such radical approaches and has, I believe, found them wanting. He makes the striking point that an absolute chronology is not possible using the letters alone, and that one is even limited with respect to relative chronology (pp. 231–4).

R. is a first-class historian of early Christianity. He combines an excellent knowledge of the literary sources (and inscriptional, numismatic, and archaeological evidence) with a fine sense of historical judgement. In the course of the discussion R. argues that the Acts of the Apostles, distrusted by many theologians (such as Lüdemann), actually turns out to be a source giving remarkably coherent and accurate information. So, for example, the Claudius edict which R. dates to 49 (using Orosius) coheres very well with Acts 18.2 where Paul, arriving in Corinth, meets two Jewish Christians, Priscilla and Aquila, who had been expelled from Rome by Claudius. Paul's stay in Corinth can, by means of the Gallio-inscription, be dated to 50–1 (he appears before Gallio, *ἀνθύπατος τῆς Ἀχαΐας*, in Acts 18.12–15). Further, R. finds good reasons for accepting tradition which is unique to Acts such as Paul's Roman citizenship (which has been questioned in a number of recent studies). R. believes that in Acts there is eye-witness material: the author of the passages written in the first person plural is the same as the author of the whole work, Luke-Acts, which was written by Luke, the companion of Paul. But R., although conservative, is not a fundamentalist: there is no hidden dogma that Luke (or Paul in his letters) cannot have made mistakes.

As regards the chronology itself, R. begins by arguing for the Johannine view that Jesus died on Friday 14th Nisan (as opposed to Friday 15th Nisan in the synoptic gospels). Several factors point to A.D. 30 being the year of Jesus' crucifixion and astronomical calculations yield a precise date of 7 April A.D. 30. Paul's conversion is then dated fairly soon afterwards in A.D. 31/2. Paul engages in the first missionary journey in 45–7 (Cyprus and South Galatia). The Jerusalem council of 48 is then followed by the second missionary journey in 49–51. His third missionary journey is dated 52–7, the Caesarean imprisonment 57–9, and the Roman imprisonment 60–2.

R.'s work comprises not only chronology but also a fine study of Paul's mission strategy and the theology of his early period. But I believe it is his work on chronology which will establish this as a standard work for many years to come.

University of Nottingham RICHARD H. BELL

R. WALLACE, W. WILLIAMS: *The Three Worlds of Paul of Tarsus*. Pp. xiii + 239, 8 ills. London and New York: Routledge, 1998. Paper, £12.99. ISBN: 0-415-13592-3 (0-415-13591-5 hbk).

For the classicist, this book succeeds in two apparently contradictory aims. First, it provides an overview of the history and cultures of the Eastern Mediterranean and Asia Minor during the period from about 200 B.C. to 200 A.D. Secondly, it deals with some details of daily life for one particular individual—Paul—in that period. The points of detail which are covered are those which are relevant to a study of Paul (e.g. travel, citizenship, slavery). The premise of the book is that Paul—unusually—was a part of three worlds, the Hellenistic, the Roman, and the native (in his case the Jewish). With this as a 'peg', these three worlds, and the interaction between them, are discussed from various angles. A wide variety of primary and secondary sources is quoted, including many passages from the Acts of the Apostles and Paul's letters.

The book begins with a summary of how Judaism existed in the context of the Hellenized world which was forced to interact with the Roman world. There follows a section on the relevant geography and then one on travel, dealing especially with the hazards of sea voyages.

The section on peoples, cultures, and languages starts with a (too) brief description of some of the native cultures of Greece, Macedonia, Asia Minor, Syria, and Palestine. Much of this concerns language, with an interesting section on the users of Aramaic, Hebrew, and Phoenician. Then there are longer discussions of the process of Hellenization and Hellenistic institutions, followed by the rise of Roman rule and the contrasting approaches to colonial government of the Greeks and the Romans. The existence side by side of Greek and Roman cultures and the adoption of aspects of each by the other are noted.

Part 3, on the city, the state, and the individual, deals first with what defines a *polis* and the adoption of Greek-like legends by cities wishing to emulate the Greek model. For example, some Hellenistic Jews (following Hekataios in the fourth century B.C.) claimed Moses as the founder and law-giver of Jerusalem. The religion, culture, and politics of *poleis* are described and there is a brief discussion of whether, in the ancient world, the town was economically dependent on the countryside or vice versa. There is an interesting discussion of possible sources for the individual's sense of identity (tribe, language, citizenship, or kindred according to Cicero). Greeks felt themselves to be citizens of a *polis*; Roman citizenship was a legal and political status. The Jews did not fit easily into any of the usual categories, being scattered, not monolingual, and citizens of a huge variety of cities. For them identity was based on the worship of their God. The choice of competing philosophies is outlined, with succinct summaries of the beliefs of Stoics and Epicureans (though less on the Cynics). Possible influences of these schools on Jewish and Christian ideas are discussed very briefly, together with cases of deliberate adoption of Greek ideas. Citizenship of *polis* and Rome are compared, with consideration of how these might be obtained. In particular, perhaps Paul obtained his Roman citizenship as a result of an enslaved ancestor's being freed and given this citizenship, as was occasionally the custom. The huge variety in the practice of slavery, and indeed the excellent prospects for certain slaves, are described, as well as the lack of opposition to it by Paul.

The last section concerns the places visited by Paul, with a brief summary of their histories, noting any significant aspects as background to Paul's visits. Buildings and other features visible to the modern tourist are also described.

For students of Biblical studies this book provides broad historical and cultural background to the New Testament. It also includes interesting snippets about small details. An example is some speculation about the reason for Paul's unusual journey through the dangerous mountain country of Pisidia from Perge to Antioch in Pisidia (Acts 13.14). Other sources show that Sergius Paulus, governor of Cyprus, whom Paul had just left, was a native of Antioch and had connections with the best families there. This was an opportunity not to be missed.

There is surprisingly little discussion of religion and no attempt to relate Paul's world to his theology—either Jewish or Christian. But as a succinct introduction to the cultures of the period, spiced with some fascinating cameos of daily life, the book is a success. There is a bibliography which lists about 180 publications.

Stratford-upon-Avon PETER BALAAM

J. NELSON KRAYBILL: *Imperial Cult and Commerce in John's Apocalypse*. (Journal for the Study of the New Testament, Supplement 132.) Pp. 262, 10 pls. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996. £33/$49. ISBN: 1-85075-616-3.

> Babylon is become a place of demons, a haunt of every foul and hateful bird, a haunt of every foul and hateful beast. (Revelation 18)

The great attack on Rome, which is to say Babylon, and the prediction of its end in Revelation 18 has always seemed an odd mixture of the apocalyptic and the banal:

> All shipmasters and seafarers, sailors and all whose trade is on the sea, stood far off and cried out as they saw the smoke of her burning.

Vivid enough, no doubt, but there seems to be a curious specificity about the repeated emphasis in the chapter on trade, traders, seafarers, and the loss of the profitable activities that follow on the fall of the great city. In this very inventive and entertaining book J. Nelson Kraybill brings to bear on the prophetic text a picture of Roman commercial activities in the period, with a view to showing what the author might have had in mind. He is of course able to demonstrate without too much difficulty that Rome was a great market for Mediterranean trade, that the list of goods in Rev. 18.12–13, '. . . gold, silver, jewels and pearls, fine linen, purple silk and scarlet, all kinds of scented wood, all articles of ivory, all articles of costly wood, bronze, iron and marble, cinnamon, spice, incense, myrrh, frankincense, wine, olive oil, choice flour and wheat, cattle and sheep, horses and chariots, slaves'—and human lives—is not at all a bad shot at the range of products, both luxury and staple, with which Roman and provincial merchants and shippers would have been concerned and on which their livelihood would have depended. Whatever we make of the identity of John of Patmos, he seems to have been in a position to give a fair breakdown of Rome's trading activities and to identify imaginatively with the losses that business would have sustained, if his prophetic vision had come true at the time.

There are two serious issues that this argument raises for the situation of Christians in this early period of their history. First, K. argues that the implication must be that some Christians were seriously involved in trading with Rome, or the warnings would have had no bite; the point of their presence in the text must, he thinks, be a reference to a real evil within the community as the prophet himself saw it. Secondly, he claims that one major reason for the existence of the problem was the involvement of commerce in the Empire with the practice of the imperial cult. He seeks to show that the worship of the Emperor was one of the central concerns of Revelation and that, as a matter of fact, evidence of the cult can be found in constant association with commercial activity. So, the prophet's objection to commerce by Christians is that they could not both make a living by trading and avoid entanglement in the Emperor's abominable worship.

Both these propositions are interesting and suggestive, but neither seems entirely convincing. The first finds at least some support in the tendency of recent years (see, for instance, D. Kyrtatas, *The Social Structure of the Early Christian Communities* [London, 1987]; W. A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: the Social World of the Apostle Paul* [New Haven, 1993]) to argue that the early Christian groups did not consist predominantly of the poorest sections of society, but at least included better educated and more prosperous supporters from the beginning; why not therefore rich merchants among their number? But what must be remembered is that even at the end of the first century A.D., the supposed date of Jolin's prophecy, the total number of Christians must have been very small and the suggestion that they already included a group of powerful merchants seems highly improbable, though of course not inherently impossible.

The second proposition raises more complicated issues. The text of Revelation that brings the imperial cult into the argument at all is, of course, the prophecy of the Second Beast in Chapter XIII, which K. interprets, as many have, as a reference specifically to the priests of the cult. Even if that interpretation is right, which is likely but hardly certain, we should need to have hard evidence to justify the idea that trading activity as such forced individuals into adherence to the worship of the Emperor in particular. Underlying the view there seems to be a misconception that the cult was far more centralized and unified than it ever was, that you had in some sense to 'belong' to it if you wanted to get ahead in a pagan world.

K. is, in a sense, accidentally distorting the evidence precisely by his privileging of the

intersection of commerce and Emperor-worship. Cult both of the old gods and goddesses and of the newer *Divi* was ubiquitous, and therefore intersected with all other activities in a pagan community, whether commercial or not. It is no doubt true that members of small communities of Jews and Christians would have had to compromise with the need to appear at festivals and to dine in colleges or guilds, if they were to get ahead in their businesses, and that from a strictly Christian viewpoint they might have been seen as risking their immortal souls to pursue their earthly profits. There is nothing impossible in the suggestion that this problem underlies the rhetoric of Revelation 18; but by the same logic, nothing requires that the worship of the Emperor should be any more than one part of the religious context in which this rhetoric would have operated.

It is difficult in the end to avoid the feeling that these ideas risk taking the prophetic text too literally. It is already important and very significant that such a hostile observer saw not just the power, wealth, and injustice of Rome, but also, as an integral part of his vision, the commercial and trading activity that sustained it. It hardly seems necessary to seek an explanation for this insight in terms of discovering Christians specifically involved in commercial activities. It was illuminating to ask the question; the answer remains in doubt.

University College London J. A. NORTH

S. P. Brock, S. A. Harvey: *Holy Women of the Syrian Orient*. Pp. xix + 197, 1 ill., 1 map. Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California Press, 1998 (first published cased in 1987). Paper, £12.50. ISBN: 0-520-21366-1.

The holy women here assembled manifested masculine fortitude in many ways—by transvestitism (the Antiochene actress/prostitute Pelagia, the noble eunuch Anastasia), by ecstatic vagrancy (John of Ephesus' Mary) or playing the fool for Christ (the 'mad' nun of Tabennesi: Chapter VI), by astounding feats of aceticism (Mary, Shirin)—though, alas, no stylites, and above all by superhuman endurance in martyrdom (the Persian Anahid, Febronia of Nisibis). Yet their sex often imposed special tribulation: male lust, rejection of an earthly husband, nakedness, and horrific butchery in martyrdom (Anahid presents her severed breasts to her Magian torturer, her subsequent reward—a wasp cortège).

But these eight testimonies (fourth to seventh centuries) are no homogeneous feminist manifesto. On the contrary, diversity is more striking: source-material ranges from the bare catalogue of Persian martyrs (p. 77) to the 'uplifting tale' (p. 142), style from simple narrative to high rhetoric; geographical scope spans Egypt, Palestine, Mesopotamia, Persia, and Iraq, desert and city; persecutors may be pagans, Persians, Jews, or Chalcedonian Christians. In some ways the chief anomaly is the exclusion of men—her father's martyrdom is cut from the narrative of Anahid, and Arethas, leader of the Najranites, is excluded from Chapter IV, both by gender and because his martyrdom is not extant in Syriac. The latter criterion, however, cuts both ways: Golindouch too (cf. Theoph. Sim. v. 12) is omitted, since her Syriac *Life* is lost. Many of these documents were composed in Syriac, but others originated in Greek (Pelagia, Anastasia), or have later Greek or Latin versions (Abraham's Mary).

The introduction provides clear and succinct access to the world of Syrian holiness with sections on the Syrian Orient in late antiquity (a cultural battleground), literature on saints, and women in hagiography. Keynotes for Syrian spirituality are the asceticism inherited from Judaism and poetry (p. 12), represented here by Mary's lament (pp. 37–9). The decade since the first edition (1987) has seen major developments in approaches to hagiography, amongst which the new preface highlights shift in interest from historicity to rhetoric (p. xiv). But this volume, its bibliography newly updated, will readily survive scholarship's post-millennial evolution.

King's College London MARY WHITBY

J. E. SALISBURY: *Perpetua's Passion. The Death and Memory of a Young Roman Woman.* Pp. 228, 6 ills. New York and London: Routledge, 1997. Paper. ISBN: 0-415-91837-5.

This is an accessible, sincere, and generally well-researched book which incorporates a broader historical agenda within an empathetic and imaginative approach to the famous Christian martyr, Perpetua. S. is open and honest about her quest for the combination of circumstances and motives that might explain Perpetua's Christian faith, her steady conviction, and the way she faced death in the Carthaginian arena. S.'s methodology is both refreshing and risky: 'A question that has always troubled me as I have studied the past is simply "What were they thinking?" ' (p. 1) and 'In Perpetua's diary, we can see the way she brought the memories of her Carthaginian and Roman past to serve the immediate experience of her martyrdom, to be relevant to her present' (p. 179). A study, no matter how elucidatory, of material realities, culture, and ideas in Roman Carthage which might have influenced Perpetua's formative years results in a coherent but speculative intellectual 'photo fit' of the young martyr.

There is also the vexed question of balance in an approach of this kind. The earlier chapters of the book might leave the reader wondering whether Perpetua is becoming something of a peg on which to hang a survey of Roman civilization in a high-profile province and city. However, S. more than vindicates certain focuses as the book progresses. For instance, her fluent elaboration of the concept of numinous spaces (pp. 6–10) ties in well with her perceptive comments on the locality and psychology of spectacle, when she deals with the Carthaginian amphitheatre in Chapter V, 'The Arena'.

At other times, S. over-eggs the pudding. I am not convinced that the ancient Romances encouraged an embryonic youth culture, with their much tried and tested heroes and heroines serving, albeit subliminally, as rôle models for Perpetua and her comrades-in-suffering: 'These novels praised the idea of young people—teenagers—standing up for what they wanted. This was not Roman, but it was what the young Perpetua did when she defied her family to follow Christ' (p. 47).

While on the subject of fictional narratives, it is in her use of the ancient Latin novel that S. is guilty of some interpretative slippage. S.'s use of the fictional medium as evidence for social and religious realities puts her on dangerous ground. There is a cavalier conflation of the author, Apuleius, with his hero/narrator, Lucius, on pp. 28–32. The jury is still out on the question of Apuleius being himself a priest of Isis and such a ready identification of author with narrator is, in any case, not good practice, especially when so much work has been, and is being, done on the layers of complexity in ego narrative.

Alongside some quibbles with the way ancient sources have been used by S., some secondary scholarship is recycled and relied upon a little uncritically, pp. 49–57 dealing with tenacious traditions in Carthage of human sacrifice and sacrificial suicide. This is an interesting survey which might be construed as a back-handed compliment to Carthaginian culture, since the persistence of such a practice could be viewed as demonstrating local particularity in the context of Roman hegemony. Christian writers and biblical texts rub shoulders with modern commentators in the footnotes to this discussion, and some of their assumptions and interpretations could have been legitimately challenged.

However, the book is engaging and absorbing. The teasing out of the disparate cultural influences evident in Perpetua's diary and dreams, and how these might have been rationalized and spiritualized by Perpetua herself, make the chapter entitled 'Prison' both stimulating and satisfying. I felt at this point that S.'s strategy for the book emerged as persuasive and plausible; namely, the realization of general trends through a particular and exceptional character who in turn enriched and resignified the cultural and intellectual patterns she had inherited.

'Aftermath', the final chapter, reveals the process by which the memory of Perpetua and Felicity was 'resignified', and the women, to a certain extent, disempowered, partly, at least, to suit the ideological interest of the later Christian male hierarchies, for whom martyrs were, *per se*, a moveable feast. This makes an ironic endnote to a book which has taken pains to represent Perpetua truthfully and sympathetically, but S. does not pass judgement on the ancient mediators of the martyrs' text: 'The constant reinterpretation of the text is not necessarily a bad thing. In this opinion, I depart from most who have commented on the history of Perpetua's memory' (pp. 178–9). Whether one agrees or not, this kind of comment is characteristic of an author who does not shirk ownership of her arguments with all their implications and tensions.

Open University PAULA JAMES

K. R. POPPER: *The World of Parmenides. Essays on the Presocratic Enlightenment* (edited by Arne F. Petersen, with the assistance of Jørgen Mejer). Pp. x + 328. London and New York: Routledge, 1998. Cased, £30. ISBN: 0-415-17301-9.

Karl Popper's 'Back to the Presocratics', first published in *PAS* 59 (1958–9) and reprinted in the successive editions of *Conjectures and Refutations* (1963–89), was his great contribution to scholarly conversation about early Greek thought. It remains an exceptionally useful tool for teaching. Together with Geoffrey Kirk's response (*Mind* 69 [1960]), it focuses students' attention on the issue of the 'scientific' status of Presocratic theorizing, and more generally on the applicability of modern analytical categories to ancient material; the passion with which it is written continues to excite, and the interpretations offered remain fruitfully questionable. Probably less well known is a briefer—but still striking—article on the two parts of Parmenides' poem and the nature of the Parmenidean project, published in *CQ* 42 (1992). Revised versions of both appear in the present volume, now accompanied by large quantities of further material on the same and related topics. Some of the pieces have been published previously as segments of larger works, others existed before only as unpublished lectures, and yet others have been assembled from scatters of published notes and unpublished materials in the Popper *Nachlass*. The collection was begun by P. himself, and completed by his editor, Arne Petersen.

Although some new problems are tackled and interpretations advanced in these further chapters, by and large the picture to emerge is a familiar one. P. prized the Presocratics because he saw in them significant foundations and anticipations of the great success story of Western science, including (importantly) his own ideas of the scientific method; in their pioneering enthusiasm, and acceptance of the limitations of human knowledge, they escaped the delusion of certainty so disastrously imposed on scientific investigation by Aristotle (about whom Dante [pp. 4, 276] was both right and horribly wrong!). Xenophanes unsurprisingly emerges as a hero in Essay 2, largely on the strength of his statement of Popperian principle in fr. B34 (in which the word *dokos* is Popperized as 'conjecture'). This is an essay one wishes P. himself had lived to complete; rehabilitations of Xenophanes are good to have, but this one, assembled largely by the editor, is rambling and repetitious. Parmenides, who is the focus of Essays 3–7 (and frr. 0–5 in the Appendix), engages attention both for the fascination of his own thinking about knowledge and the cosmos, and for the crucial impetus he gave to science by inspiring the response of the atomists. In a series of returns to this territory (some in effect successive drafts of the same piece) P. worries away at the intellectual and biographical foundations of Parmenides' arguments, and the problem of the relationship between his Two Ways, of Truth and of Mortal Opinion. Essays 8–10, finally, are more diverse, covering ancient views of the mind–body problem, induction, and aspects of Plato's approach to geometry.

In some ways, this careful sweeping-up of P.'s residual thoughts on Greek philosophy and science will be of more interest to Popperians than to Classicists, but with a little patience and selectivity there are good things here for Classicists too. P.'s readings of individual texts are often almost embarrassingly questionable; there is something Procrustean about the way he understands the Presocratics in the light of his own (contestable and contested) view of the nature and history of science; and what he has to say is miles away from recent trends in professional scholarship in this area. But the seriousness and the personal engagement he brings to bear are instructive and inspiring. And it would be a shame never to have met Parmenides' much-loved, blind elder sister (pp. 78, 290–1).

King's College London M. B. TRAPP

S. SELLMER: *Argumentationsstrukturen bei Parmenides*. Pp. vii + 208. Bern, etc.: Peter Lang, 1998. Paper, £24. ISBN: 3-631-33913-5.

This revised *Magisterarbeit* consists of two sections. The first five chapters discuss Parmenides frr. B2, B3, B6.1–2, and B8.1–49. For each fragment, the Greek text and S.'s German translation precede a brief commentary and a discussion focused on structural issues, but closely based on the text. Chapters VI and VII examine the methods, structures, and foundations of Parmenides' argumentation. I concentrate on them.

S. proposes that Parmenides had an intuitive, mystical experience and that the *Aletheia* is his

necessarily unsuccessful attempt to express that experience in rational, argumentative form. The experience P. underwent is called the Mach-experience (after Ernst Mach, to whom on one occasion 'the world together with my self suddenly appeared to me as one coherent mass of sensations' [p. 159]), which H. Schmitz describes as a state in which 'time is replaced by present eternity and a person affected thus is forcefully visited by that which is remote in space and time; the true everpresent essence of things which is concealed under normal conditions of life, forces its way through and absorbs all affections in the purity of intensive existence, which densely fills everything' (p. 160). This experience was decisive for P.'s outlook, and P.'s contribution to philosophy consisted in his determination to treat it rationally and employ it to solve current philosophical problems (p. 200).

However, this experience defies any attempt to describe its content, because it involves apprehending the world (including our self) as a single, undifferentiated whole, while language requires us to analyse the experience into separate facts (p. 175). Accordingly, the contradictions and inconsistencies in the *Aletheia* are not due to a confused and awkward archaic mode of expression (e.g. one that fails to distinguish between 'things' and 'stuffs'), but rather to language's inherent inability to represent the object of this experience (p. 163).

S. underlines the importance of the concept of binding or fettering, which P. deploys in treating most of the attributes of *τὸ ἐόν*. Fettering is a metaphor for the relation between reality and necessity. *τὸ ἐόν* is a kind of 'proto-object' that emerges from reflection on the 'object-less' Mach-experience; it necessarily binds together in itself attributes stemming from the experience's special nature—attributes that cannot be simultaneously applied without incoherence to familiar objects (p. 174). Furthermore, fettering can be seen to represent P.'s effort to preserve in words the unity of the experience (p. 174).

S. claims that some attributes of *τὸ ἐόν* (indivisibility, immobility, self-identity, and perfection or completeness) are part of the impression generated by the Mach-experience, while others (being ungenerated, indestructible, and an object of *νοεῖν*) are not, and that P. employs different kinds of arguments in the two cases. P. does not strictly argue for predicates in the first group, but rather explains them, and each explanation has the same structure: each property is clarified through 'explicative ring-composition' (pp. 181–3). By contrast, the attributes in the second group are proved to belong to *τὸ ἐόν* by regular arguments (pp. 183–4).

On this view, the arguments in B8.1–49 do not possess the tight logical connection that Owen and others have found (which, for example, enables S. to dismiss without much discussion the temporal interpretation of B8.22–5 [p. 101]). But it does scant justice to the fact that most or all the attributes of the first group are consequences of the inadmissibility of *τὸ μὴ ἐόν* and/or the impossibility of anything being generated out of *τὸ μὴ ἐόν*.

Even those who reject S.'s psychologizing reading of Parmenides will profit from his detailed and sensitive discussions of words and passages, although access to them is made harder by the absence of a subject index and an *index locorum*.

Pomona College RICHARD McKIRAHAN

M. L. McPherran (ed.): *Wisdom, Ignorance and Virtue: New Essays in Socratic Studies*. Pp. xi + 155. Edmonton: Academic Printing & Publishing, 1997. Paper, $24.95 (Cased, $64.95). ISBN: 0-920980-71-6 (0-920980-70-8 hbk).

These ten essays are versions of conference papers presented at the Arizona Colloquium on Socrates held in February 1996 on the familiar theme of the connection between knowledge and virtue in Socratic thought: the shadow of Gregory Vlastos lurks over most of the volume, which is readily accessible, requires no knowledge of Greek, and has a philosophical focus.

The first article, by L. Gerson, suggests that Vlastos argues that Socrates' absolutist prohibition of wrongdoing is inherent in his belief that virtue is the sovereign good in our domain of value, and hence that wrongdoing harms the soul. Contra Vlastos, Gerson argues that Socrates' absolutist prohibition of wrongdoing rests upon his identity of the soul with the self, and hence it undermines personal or self-identity.

On the same theme—the claim that 'one should never do what is unjust' (cf. *Crito* 49b8), C. Young argues that Socrates must believe that one can never recover from an unjust act. However, his problematic example of choosing an unjust act (escaping from prison) that leads to

a life of such extreme agony that philosophical activity is impossible confuses an unjust act that harms the body, not the soul.

In a lucid and incisive account, D. Graham revisits the perennial problem of the relationship between virtue and knowledge, focusing his inquiry on the paradox implicit in Socrates' principle that virtue is knowledge, coupled with his disavowal of knowledge and yet his apparently virtuous life. Rather than discussing the vast literature on this subject, he makes his own case, in a carefully reasoned account, that these points are compatible.

Hope E. May presents an argument for the *elenchos* as therapy, by which she means it improves understanding and hence the moral life. However, her essay rather ignores those passages in which the *elenchos* simply reveals ignorance, and no 'therapy' appears to take place (e.g. Meletus, in particular, and the people of Athens more generally) in the *Apology*.

As part of a larger project, S. La Barge explores Socrates' objection (in the *Charmides*) to knowledge of knowledge since it only tells us *that* someone knows, not *what* he knows. He suggests that other dialogues, particularly the *Meno*, provide a partial remedy: technical expertise plus common knowledge can lead to reliable judgement, so that we do not need to know what the expert knows in order to recognize her expertise.

Another look at the *Charmides* is provided by V. Tsouna, who argues that the personality of Critias is more complex than as usually presented, and this complexity bears on his notions of his lack of temperance, is devoid of an ethical dimension, and therefore has nothing to do with the good or happy life.

H. Benson's contribution is a preliminary programmatic sketch of the nature of Socratic *dunamis*—its main features, topics of investigation, and difficulties. As such, it is a working paper that, we are promised, will lead to a comprehensive account of Socratic dynamic theory. However, this essay is of great philosophical interest, worth reading on its own merits, especially in view of the development of the term in Plato and Aristotle.

T. Brickhouse and N. Smith ask the highly appropriate question of why Socrates could advocate punishment, particularly non-educational forms of punishment, since he believed that 'all who do wrong do so involuntarily in some sense' (p. 95). They argue effectively that rightly applied punishment is educational and, very provocatively and thoughtfully, that even non-educational punishment can free the soul from addiction to pleasure.

In asking 'Why Did Plato Write Socratic Dialogues?' W. Prior builds on a classic article by C. Kahn, and rejects the scholarly consensus that the early dialogues give us Plato's picture of the historical Socrates. Prior suggests that the early and middle dialogues form an extended meditation on what it means to live the life of the philosopher; and that the dialogue form is a necessary medium for confronting and contrasting that life with others.

In the final article, M. McPherran presents a recast version of part of a chapter ('Socrates and his Accusers') in his *The Religion of Socrates* (University Park, 1996). Well informed and well argued, this essay demonstrates that Socrates was guilty of non-recognition of the gods of the state as conceived by the jurors, but that he also might well have argued innocence of this particular charge.

These brief summaries do not do justice to the philosophical interest of these articles, which can be read profitably by both scholars and students of Socrates.

Wellesley College MAUD H. CHAPLIN

H. Lawson-Tancred: *Plato's* Republic *and the Greek Enlightenment*. Pp. viii + 96, 10 ills. London: Duckworth, 1998. Paper, £8.95. ISBN: 1-85399-494-4.

B. Williams: *Plato: The Invention of Philosophy*. Pp. iv + 57. London: Orion, 1998. Paper, £3. ISBN: 0-73580-215-5.

Lawson-Tancred's brief study of Plato is well complemented by Williams's still briefer one. Both are engaged and engaging personal responses to the problem of a philosophy that clothes itself in dialogues that have to be stripped off to reveal—what? The nature of naked Platonic truth eludes us. W. is characteristic, L.-T. idiosyncratic; yet L.-T.'s apparent eccentricity may find a place against the background of W.'s plausibility.

L.-T. declares in his preface (p. viii), 'I will claim that the dialogues, at least of [Plato's early and middle] periods, should not properly be classified as works of philosophy at all and, in particular, I will contest the claim that Plato ever advanced anything that could plausibly be labelled the Theory of Forms.' W. distances the dialogues at least from any philosophical destination: 'The action is always somewhere else, in a place where we, and typically Socrates himself, have not been. The results are never in the text before us' (p. 44). And he agrees that there is really no such thing as 'the Theory of Forms': instead, 'It is more helpful to see Plato as having a general conception of a Form . . .; having also a set of philosophical questions; and as continually asking how such objects might contribute, in various ways, to answering those various questions' (p. 32). Philosophy then becomes a character in search of an identity. For W., it is theory, but not *a* theory: 'Plato did think that if you devoted yourself to theory, this could change your life. He did think, at least at one period, that pure studies might lead one to a transforming vision . . . But he never thought that a theory would, at some suitably advanced level, explain the vital thing you needed to know' (p. 44). L.-T. writes similarly of philosophy that is not *a* philosophy (p. 2), and is to occur not in but after the dialogues (p. 34); this is a way of living and thinking to be mastered for the sake of an insight and awareness not otherwise obtainable (p. 78). He sees this 'as a kind of intellectualized version of the appeal made by the mystery cults' (p. 67), though in promising not 'some hidden body of knowledge' (p. 78), but a *vita nuova*. When L.-T. writes of 'the long, sleepy afternoon of Hellenistic and eventually Roman thought' (p. 5), he is perhaps intelligibly unfashionable: the mistake then may have been to petrify theory into theories.

What L.-T. and W. share is evidently worthwhile. Less certain is how much extra L.-T. has achieved through reading 'in the beautiful surroundings of [the Earl of Oxford and Asquith's] library at Mells' (p. vii). Counting Alcibiades among 'the guests' at Agathon's party (p. 82) would just be a slip if it did not miss a point: 'His part has to be something separate, dramatic, not a contribution under the rules of the occasion' (W., p. 19). The status of the *Apology* as fact, faction, or fiction seems inconsistently indicated (cf. pp. 25, 30, 35, 40). And a central claim is unclear: 'The bulk of this book is devoted to showing that Plato followed closely in the footsteps of the most important sophists and especially of Gorgias and that this entire conception of the art of philosophical writing was essentially sophistic' (p. 19). Much more needs to be said than is said here, not about the social rôle of the sophists and their love of rhetoric, but about the style and content of their writings; and then about how Plato entirely respected their essence while transforming their purpose.

L.-T. also risks devaluing his approach through inflation. He deconstructs Kallipolis ('this Ancient Greek Waco'), declaring, 'It seems unreasonable to suppose that . . . [Plato's] intention was to do anything more than dramatize the absurdity of an encroachment by political science on the territory of philosophy' (p. 75); but 'unreasonable' gives no reason. He even asks about tripartition of soul: 'Should we embrace the conclusion that the point of this analysis of the personality and its associated account of personal morality is just that it is obviously unsatisfactory?' (p. 76); *obviously*?

L.-T. has something to add to W.; but perhaps, at times, it is too little, or too much.

Birkbeck College, London A. W. PRICE

S. M. Nikolaou: *Die Atomlehre Demokrits und Platons* Timaios. Pp. 233. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1998. Cased. ISBN: 3-519-07661-6.

N.'s monograph is an apparently unrevised version of a dissertation submitted in the summer of 1997 to the Philosophy Faculty of the University of Cologne. The longer first part is a competent survey of basic atomist doctrines presented against the background of earlier Presocratic speculation. A scrappier and briefer second part discusses the old chestnut of whether the *Timaeus* envisages a beginning for the cosmos, and then turns to its account of the receptacle and the geometrical analysis of the four elements. The author seems more engaged by the Platonic material and by the scholarly debates about it; the speculations of the Tübingen school are particularly prominent in her discussion. Insofar as she redeems a promise in her subtitle to offer a comparative treatment of the two theories, it is mostly to be found in a very brief final part. Untranslated Greek abounds.

There is little here that will be unfamiliar to a scholar interested in the topic. It is accordingly doubtful whether publication—particularly between hard covers—would have been justified even if the dissertation had undergone the revision needed to make of it an interesting book. As it is, the two main parts are written in very different styles and with minimal mutual connection. It is clear that the author believes that comparison between Democritus and Plato is heavily to the latter's advantage, but quite why is left obscure. Virtually no detailed argument is brought to bear on the issue, and no attempt is made to respond, for example, to Aristotle's well-known case for the contrary verdict.

A recent German contributor to *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* (*BMCR* 99.4.20) commented that consideration of the book he was reviewing 'raises the disturbing question of whether the German academic system can continue to flood the shrinking market of scholarly monographs with unrevised dissertations of questionable value'. I feel the same.

St John's College, Cambridge MALCOLM SCHOFIELD

E. N. Ostenfeld (ed.): *Essays on Plato's* Republic. Pp. 119. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1998. Cased. ISBN: 87-7288-785-0.

As with most conference volumes, the quality of papers is variable; but there is something here to interest most Platonic scholars. Predictably, the editor implies coherence via an imaginative introduction, and the use of catch-all 'sections' (one on metaphysics and moral psychology, another on science and myth).

The collection opens with a fine paper by Lesley Brown on totalitarianism, already on my undergraduate reading list. B. puts to rest the Popperian organic view, and there are many engaging *aperçus* (the 'noble lie' is not really a lie at all, since the metals stand for genuine properties in human nature). B. rejects the individualistic account of Vlastos, but why, for example, should the beauty of the statue at 420c–d be anything over and above the beauty of its individual parts, seen as parts of a statue?

Frederik Arends claims that Plato avoids *stasis* by ensuring that the philosophers have a non-materialistic conception of *eudaimonia* that differs from the conceptions of the other classes. But he fails to explain why the lower classes do not want to boot the philosophers out anyway.

Bodil Due compares the views of Plato and Xenophon on political instability, education, equality, and temperance. Space prevents her digging deeply, but she notes some overlaps and contrasts.

Rafael Ferber adds an appendix to his book *Platos Idee des Guten* (Sankt Augustin, 1989), discussing the Aristotelian claim that the Form is useless. Like Nicholas D. Smith, castigated in the notes, I am 'behind the actual state of research' in not having read F.'s related work. But F. did not persuade me in this piece that αὐτὸ τἀκριβὲς of the *Politicus* is the Form of the Good.

I remained unpersuaded also by Henrik Thyssen's defence of the old view that Plato did not change his mind about *akrasia* in the *Republic*. 'Where is the argument?,' T. asks, one answer, of course, being the argument from opposites. That will not satisfy T., since he sees the parts of the soul as standing merely for different types of desires, and the 'conflict' as between not belief and desire but desire and the content of belief. Hmmm . . .

Erik Ostenfeld writes on *eudaimonia* in the *Republic*. He covers a lot of ground in rather a hurry, and makes the arguable claim that pleasure in Book 9 is not a consequence of justice, but partly constitutive of it. But there is much of interest here, especially in his discussion of the happiness of the various classes.

After a short piece by Eirikur Siguardson on the Platonic view of astronomy in the *Republic*, noting the important point that that view is expressed in the context of a practical educational proposal and not as part of a philosophy of science, the volume ends with a fascinating and wide-ranging discussion by Lars Albinus of *katabasis* in Platonic myth, drawing some fruitful parallels between the myth of Er, the cave, and the structure of the *Republic* itself.

St Anne's College, Oxford ROGER CRISP

G. A. Seeck: *Nicht-Denkfehler und natürliche Sprache bei Platon: Gerechtigkeit und Frömmigkeit in Platons* Protagoras. (Zetemata 96.) Pp. 162. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1997. Paper, DM 68. ISBN: 3-406-42393-0.

This book is an extended commentary on Plato's *Protagoras* 330c1–331c1, where Socrates argues that justice and holiness are identical, since justice is holy and holiness is just. More particularly Seeck discusses the propriety of certain sentences produced in the course of the argument: 1(a) 'Holiness is holy', (b) 'Justice is just'; 2(a) 'Holiness is not just, but non-just, hence unjust', (b) 'Justice is not holy, but non-holy, hence unholy'; 3(a) 'Holiness is just', (b) 'Justice is holy'. The sentences are commonly accused of two defects. 1(a) and 1(b) involve a vicious 'self-predication'. 2(a) and 2(b) confuse contradictoriness with contrariety, moving illegitimately from 'not just/holy' to 'unjust/unholy'. S. doggedly defends Plato's sentences. The charges depend, he says, on the unwarranted assumption that 'logic can, without more ado, serve to analyse and criticise natural language' (p. 19).

To understand Plato's sentences we need to examine natural language, not impose on them the rigid categories of formal logic. S. thus explores the ideas of 'tautological predication', self-predication, contrariety, and the varieties of negation as they operate in natural language. His conclusions are these. Sentences 1(a) and 1(b) need not be objectionable. 1(b) probably combines several acceptable senses, not all obviously tautological: 'Just people are just', 'Justice has the characteristic of being just', and 'Justice (as an abstract power) operates justly' (p. 84). Secondly, in certain contexts 'not white' is equivalent to 'black': if only white horses and black horses are for sale, to ask for a horse that is not white amounts to asking for a black horse. Similarly, in certain contexts 'not just' is equivalent to 'unjust'. Hence 2(a) can be seen not as *inferring* that holiness is unjust from the supposition that it is not just, but as simply clarifying what it would be for it not to be just, namely unjust. Thirdly, sentences 2 and 3 have perfectly appropriate senses. 2(a) means: 'If holiness has nothing to do with justice, then it would contradict justice and could eventually even be identical with injustice' or, more concretely, 'If a pious man need not be just, he could approve of crimes and in the end even be a criminal' (p. 136; cf. pp. 35f.). Conversely, 3(a) means something like 'Holiness and justice are compatible' or 'Holiness implies justice' (p. 35).

S. writes engagingly and illustrates his themes with vivid examples. He refers to *Gulliver's Travels* more often than to Russell or to Frege. However, his reflections on natural language, interesting and plausible as they are, shed little light on Plato's contested sentences. This may be because S. tends to consider the sentences in isolation and not as part of an argument intended to persuade Protagoras of his error. The difficulty lies not in finding innocuous interpretations of sentences 2 and 3, but in finding innocuous interpretations such that, firstly, Protagoras is bound to reject 2 and accept 3, and, secondly, his rejection of 2 and acceptance of 3 imply that piety is not distinct from justice in the way he originally supposed. S. proposes no such interpretation. If 2(a) means 'Holiness does not entail justice, but is compatible with injustice', Protagoras has no compelling reason to reject it. In terms of his comparison of virtues with parts of a face, a pretty mouth is compatible with an ugly nose. A pious person may then be unjust and thus bad overall, just as a face with a pretty mouth may be ugly overall. (Beauty is partly contextual: a mouth can hardly be pretty if the rest of the face is *wholly* repellent. But that seems irrelevant to the argument here.) If 2(a) means 'Holiness excludes justice' (p. 35), Protagoras has reason to reject it, but this does not tell against his own view. A pretty nose is distinct from a pretty mouth, but neither excludes the other. Conversely, if 3(a) means 'Holiness is compatible with justice', he should accept it, but this does not refute his own view. If it means 'Holiness entails justice' it would refute his own view, but he has no reason to accept it. S. provides no unambiguous paraphrases of 2 and 3 that would avoid this difficulty. Hence he is left with a dilemma. *Either* Plato's sentences are to be left as they stand; then it *looks* as if Protagoras should reject 2 and accept 3, but they are still apparently open to serious objections from logicians. *Or* they can be paraphrased into logically innocent language; then the argument essentially involves a fallacy of equivocation. In either case Protagoras should remain unconvinced.

Trinity College, Oxford MICHAEL INWOOD

A. TAGLIA: *Il concetto di* pistis *in Platone*. Pp. xiii + 200. Florence: Casa Editrice Le Lettere, 1998. Paper, L. 38,000. ISBN: 88-7166-356-X.

This book originated, it appears, in a dissertation whose topic is, as often, justified by the observation that no specific study of the subject currently exists. The observation might equally well suggest that no such study is needed, but in this case the results do validate T.'s endeavor, as she traces how *pistis* ('trust,' 'belief,' 'assurance') undergoes significant changes through the course of Plato's work. Concentrating primarily on *Gorgias*, *Republic*, and *Laws* (which are assumed to stand in this order chronologically), T. traces Plato's use of *pistis*/*pisteuo* and the related group of *peitho*/*peithomai* words. The result is a thorough study of a concept that is important not because it is central to Plato's thought but because it is linked in interesting ways to other central concepts, including *doxa*, *episteme*, and *paideia*. *Pistis* in Plato turns out to be more complex than one might have thought.

The work has two parts. In the first, T. examines the rôle of *pistis* in the *polis*, beginning with the positive association of *peitho* with democracy in the *Eumenides* (and the related opposition between *peitho* and *bia*) and moving on to its negative associations with demagoguery, deceit, and tyrannical power in tragedy and oratory. These genres generally present mixed views of *peitho*, and T. singles out Isocrates in particular as one who defends *peitho* while admitting its negative aspects. By contrast, in *Gorgias* Plato presents only the negative, irrational side of *peitho* without any redeeming features; but he also suggests the possibility of a positive, rational *peitho*, which in *Republic* is embodied in the philosopher-king, who through his knowledge earns the trust of the people. His use of rational persuasion distinguishes the rule of the philosopher from tyranny. Then in *Laws pistis* changes again, though not so radically, to a less rational trust or faith in the gods on the part of the members of the Nocturnal Council.

Chapter II considers the recipients of *pistis* beginning with intellectuals and poets. For Plato these only deserve trust or belief if what they say is true, and Plato's own myths are trustworthy because they are consistent with the truth. Trust in other humans is thus for Plato the direct result of their possessing knowledge. Trust in the gods is a different matter, and T. argues at some length that it neither results from belief in the gods nor even requires such belief. She tries hard to show that in *Laws* the trust that members of the Council have in the gods is not directly related to their belief, but although there is certainly a gap between *nomizo* and *pisteuo*, I remain unpersuaded that the two are as separate as she maintains.

In the second, longer part of the work T. turns to the metaphysical aspects of *pistis*, in particular its relation to *doxa* (Chapter III) and *episteme* (Chapter IV). As she admits, this discussion covers some of the same ground as Part One, but there is also much that is new. T. begins by arguing that in the early dialogues persuasion can be either positive—promoting truth in the Parmenidean tradition, or negative—promoting falsehood in the tradition of *Gorgias*. But the latter sense surely dominates the early dialogues, especially *Gorgias*, where *pistis* is linked to *empeiria* and *doxa*. *Pistis* is further linked to *eikasia* ('illusion'), which in its positive sense ('conjecture') is a means to gain knowledge about the material world, especially aspects of it that are not apparent (*aphanes*). Thus *pistis* becomes important for the education of non-guardians in *Republic* and has an even higher rôle in *Laws*, where as 'reasoned conviction' it is part of the highest stage of education reached by humans. The same general progression is evident in the contrast between *pistis* and *episteme*, which gradually diminishes over the course of Plato's work. It is strong in *Gorgias*, where both are produced by persuasion, but are qualitatively different and do not coexist. In *Republic* both are internally generated, but their objects differ (sensible vs. intelligible) and *episteme* is clearly superior. Finally, in the later dialogues *pistis* and *episteme* can be mutually supportive in the same individual.

Although I would question some of the details, T.'s work is useful, especially for scholars whose picture of *pistis* in Plato is largely dominated by the strong attack in the *Gorgias*. It would be even more useful with a subject index and an *index locorum* (there is only an index of ancient and modern authors).

University of Texas MICHAEL GAGARIN

C. HORN: *Antike Lebenskunst: Glück und Moral von Sokrates bis zu den Neuplatonikern*. Pp. 271. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1998. Paper, DM 24. ISBN: 3-406-42071-0.

Recently there has been a growing concern to assess Greco-Roman ethical thought as a whole, and to offer comparisons and contrasts between it and what is sometimes called 'modern' or post-Kantian ethics. The contrast is often seen as between ancient eudaimonistic, practical ethics, centred on the attainment of happiness and the global attitude to one's life, and modern deontological morality, centred on obligations, rules, and the adjudication of conflict. This, roughly speaking, is the background to Horn's wide-ranging and ambitious book, which tries to provide an introduction to ancient ethical thought from Socrates on, and also to raise the question of its distinctive nature.

The approach taken is thematic. After a lengthy introduction to ancient ethics, its ascetic and therapeutic models, and the various ancient portrayals of the 'philosopher', H. takes a number of what he thinks are constant themes within ancient ethics and discusses each in turn.

Chapter II takes on the concept of *eudaimonia* itself, and as such works as a general survey of the entire subject. Chapter III looks at virtue, and Chapter IV at various possible obstacles to *eudaimonia* (the affections, determinism, and so on). Within each of these sections H. gives a survey of the various ancient schools' approaches to the particular topic, usually in more or less chronological order, and also gives a brief section on the pre-philosophical or popular conceptions of virtue or happiness (in Homer, Herodotus, or other Greek literature). Each chapter includes a brief discussion of the relationship of the ancient attitude with more contemporary moral thinking. So, for example, after a tour of ancient views on *eudaimonia*, H. compares them to work by Griffin, Rawls, Nussbaum, and Sen (pp. 109–11).

Chapter V, on morality, begins with the supposed contrast between eudaimonism and the 'peculiar institution' of morality. Here the relationship between ancient and modern ethics is more fully integrated into the chapter as a whole. H. attempts to bridge the gap between teleological and deontological theories by showing that ancient systems also found room for other-concern, and for 'doing the right thing'. H.'s chief exhibit here is the Stoic theory of the *kathekon* (Lat. *officium*), which he finds very close to Kantian ideas of moral rules (pp. 204–6, 212). Unfortunately, H. does not have the space to pursue this kind of question, and here as elsewhere he merely points to an interesting line of reasoning rather than providing a satisfying and detailed discussion. Those interested in these issues would be better served by looking at S. Engstrom and J. Whiting (edd.), *Aristotle, Kant, and the Stoics: Rethinking Happiness and Duty* (Cambridge, 1996), especially the pieces by Irwin, Cooper, and Schneewind. Indeed, my impression of much of the first chapters was that H. is trying to do too much by offering summaries of Platonic, Aristotelian, Hellenistic, and later ethical thought, and also trying to bring the material together in order to make fruitful comparisons with modern ethics. As a result, the summaries of ancient material, while clear and reasonable, are concise, as are the less descriptive sections of the work, and any comparison is squeezed into the end of the chapter.

The final chapter offers a whistle-stop tour through post-classical philosophy to locate the origins of the shift in focus in ethics in Christian thought, and brings the reader up to the present day. Then H. asks whether eudaimonism has a future within ethics, and again recalls modern thinkers who have looked back to classical authors for their inspiration (Foucault, MacIntyre, Williams, Nussbaum). Here H. also discusses Julia Annas's *The Morality of Happiness* (Oxford, 1993), with which this book has evident similarities. Yet again, however, these modern works are summarized more than they are analysed, and their relation to ancient ethical thinking is stated rather than discussed or questioned. A more pressing and interesting question, one might think, is why eudaimonism is once again being touted as a viable ethical model, and here H. provides few answers. His final comment that some more recent scholarship has tended to smooth away the apparent differences between Aristotelian, Stoic, and Kantian ethical presuppositions, and that the old division between ancient teleology and modern deontology is crumbling (p. 258), does not necessarily answer this question. It might also be the case that ancient eudaimonism is again worth serious study precisely because it offers a different approach to central ethical questions.

Clare College, Cambridge JAMES WARREN

I. ANDORLINI (ed.): *'Specimina' per il* Corpus *dei papiri greci di medicina* (Atti dell'incontro di studio. Firenze, 28–29 marzo, 1996). Pp. 193, 6 ills. Florence: Istituto Papirologico 'G. Vitelli', 1997. Paper, L. 50,000.

An increasingly important source of knowledge about Greek medicine is the very considerable amount of textual material surviving on papyrus. To make this material accessible for research, an international team of experts is preparing a critically edited 'Corpus' of Greek medical papyri. The present volume contains the results of a working session of members of the team held at the Istituto Papirologico 'G. Vitelli' in Florence in 1996, and the 'specimina' here presented thus give an impression of the interest and the variety of the material (illustrated on six 'Tavole' at the back of the volume). M.-H. Marganne and P. Mertens offer a revised and updated edition of their exhaustive catalogue 'Medici et medica' (first published in 1986). M. Manfredi publishes an anonymous fragment in question-and-answer form on the anatomy of the digestive organs. D. Fausti examines the botanical vocabulary of Greek medical papyri and compares the results with literary sources such as the Hippocratic Corpus. K.-D. Fischer presents a semantic analysis of the term δελτάριον, which is only found once on papyrus. A. E. Hanson and T. Gagos compare a papyrus fragment of the Hippocratic *Epidemics* with the text as transmitted by the MSS, and append a wide-ranging study of the circulation and transmission of Hippocratic texts in the Hellenistic and early imperial period. D. Manetti discusses papyrus fragments related to the famous *PBritLibr* inv. 137 (Anonymus Londiniensis) which had been curiously overlooked by earlier editors. I. Andorlini discusses the remains of what appears to be the oldest systematic treatment of venesection, and F. Gonnelli compares papyrological material related to the medical writer Herodotus with extracts found in Aetius of Amida. The volume is well indexed, with several chapters also having their own, more specialized index.

University of Newcastle upon Tyne PHILIP J. VAN DER EIJK

J. JOUANNA: *Hippocrates* (translated by M. B. DeBevoise). Pp. xli + 520, maps. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999. Cased, £41.50. ISBN: 0-8018-5907-7.

When I reviewed the original French version of this publication (in *Mnemosyne* 49 [1996], 589–91), which came out in 1992, I recommended that this book should soon be made available in English translation to make it more easily accessible to the growing number of people in the English-speaking world who are interested in ancient medicine as part of classical civilization. I also pointed to what I perceived as a desideratum in an otherwise excellent volume: an *index locorum* which would make the work more useful to the specialist reader as well. It is gratifying to see that the English version which has now appeared does have an 'Index of Passages Cited' (in addition to a General Index, in which the 'Index des noms propres' and 'Index des notions' of the French version are amalgamated). The translator has done a fine piece of work and has judiciously dealt with the manifold quotations from the Hippocratic Corpus, which are sometimes quoted in the Loeb translation but occasionally also in a fresh translation rendering Jouanna's interpretation of the Greek original. The bibliography has also been updated and adapted to an anglophone readership. All this comes in addition to the virtues of the French version which it has preserved: a well-written, competent, and comprehensive introduction to Hippocrates, the man and his medicine, the Corpus and its many authors, their doctrines and methodologies, the Hippocratic legacy in later antiquity, and the relationship of Hippocratic medicine to the intellectual and cultural environment of the classical world.

University of Newcastle upon Tyne PHILIP J. VAN DER EIJK

W. KULLMANN, J. ALTHOFF, M. ASPER (edd.): *Gattungen wissenschaftlicher Literatur in der Antike*. (ScriptOralia 95; Reihe A: Altertumswissenschaftliche Reihe, 22.) Pp. 452. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1998. Cased, DM 158. ISBN: 3-8233-5405-1.

The present volume of the series ScriptOralia (the title of which speaks for itself), contains seventeen contributions—two in English, the rest in German—to a symposium of the same title held at Freiburg in February 1996, as well as a paper by O. Nikitinski given there in May of the same year. The symposium was the result of a project focusing on the gradual encroachment of literacy (*Verschriftlichung*) on knowledge in ancient Greece, which made it the basis of 'our modern world dominated by science'. The adoption of writing as a medium for preserving and transmitting knowledge is seen as a complex process stretching over several centuries.

Questions of literacy and orality have only recently come to be applied to areas outside epic poetry and, in particular with respect to what we would call scientific prose, this is a relatively new approach. K., A. & A. address questions concerning the function and development of forms and genres of 'scientific' literature, such as: what was considered worth writing down; what was the purpose of those writings, their intended audience, and the relationship between written output and the oral transmission of knowledge. (The editors are careful to point out that 'science' is not an ancient concept and covers areas not seen as a unity then.)

Given the number of contributions, only a brief indication of the contents of each can be provided within this limited space. Chapter I consists of four papers on medicine. R Wittern explains the heterogeneous character of early Greek medical literature by the varied origins, aims, and intended audiences. J. Althoff discusses the differing purposes of *Epidemics*, *Nutriment*, *Coan Prognoses*, and *Aphorisms*, and H. von Staden Galen's knowledge and command of literary genres, in particular his use of verse for the recipes of composite drugs. Another paper about Galen, by C. Oser-Grote, examines his introductory works as an expression of his own views about medical training and its aims.

Chapter II is constituted by two papers about zoological writings: W. Kullmann on zoological reference works and encyclopaedias, and Ä. Bäumer-Schleinhofer on the revival of zoology in the Renaissance, especially of Aristotle and paradoxography.

Two contributions concerning geography make up Chapter III: H.-J. Gehrke discusses the origins of geographical works from a combination of the experience of travel, geometrical construction, and astronomical orientation, as well as their absence of practical purpose (they were not written for sailors or travellers). D. Meyer comes to a similar conclusion by focusing on one example of the *periplous* literature, Timosthenes of Rhodes: the writings were based on travel reports, but nautical knowledge was transmitted orally.

Chapter IV has the overall topic of *artes liberales*: S. Cuomo shows the aim of Pappus' *synagoge* to be the representation of himself as an autonomous teacher of mathematics, based on the knowledge of past authorities; E. Pöhlmann distinguishes between various types of specialist literature on music; and O. Wenskus examines the rôle of the calendar in Columella's *De re rustica*.

Chapter V, the longest, contains seven papers on transdisciplinary questions of typology: A. Dihle about a classification of specialist literature according to its distance from oral instruction; G. Wöhrle about didactic poetry between the Presocratics and Hellenism; M. Asper on the typology of introductory texts, with different types intended for different levels; O. Nikitinski about the audience of Pliny's encyclopaedia and its use for education as well as for pleasure; R. W. Sharples on the similarities and differences between the *problemata* of Alexander of Aphrodisias and the Pseudo-Aristotelian ones. Of particular interest in this chapter are A. Stückelberger's contribution on (anatomical, astronomical, and geographical) atlases, suggesting that the maps in MSS of Ptolemy are the continuation of an ancient tradition, and M. Erler's paper about the use of scientific instruction as a means of dealing with life in the philosophical literature of Imperial Rome.

Usefully, the volume contains a unified bibliography as well as indices. Because of the wide range of subjects, this excellent collection should be of interest to historians of the various disciplines as well as classicists. It leaves one hoping for future similar collections, since there are many more questions to be addressed.

Department of History and Philosophy of Science, University of Cambridge C. F. SALAZAR

P. HERRMANN: *Inschriften von Milet, Teil 2, Inschriften n. 407–1019*. Pp. xii + 166, 348 ills. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1998. Cased, DM 298. ISBN: 3-11-015092-1.

This volume (VI.2 in the publication of the German excavations) is the second instalment of the corpus of Milesian inscriptions. The separate publication of the epigraphic material represents a change of direction from the original plan to publish inscriptions together with the archaeological finds from the same contexts (cf. H.'s remarks in the Introduction). The result is unfortunately a somewhat uneven corpus. Volume 1 (= *Milet* VI.1) was a reprint of the epigraphic sections of the old Miletos volumes, with an update and translations by H. at the back. Volume 3, which will be published by H.'s collaborators Günther and Ehrhardt, is thematic, covering the decrees, dedications, and sacred texts. The volume under review shows signs of both systems.

There are about 500 new texts in this volume, some of these were excavated in the 1890s (and *c*. 100 texts that were already known). Most texts are (often short) funerary inscriptions (nos 407–786). One collective epitaph was apparently in continuous use for half a century or more, and was repeatedly supplemented to include new names of the same family (458). One fragment suggests that a slave in the Roman toll-station was able to leave property to his heirs (667). There is an attractive group of epigrams (nos 731–768, 778, and 779), most of which were published by Peek and others. The *inedita* are mainly fragments, however, but no. 754 is a new funerary epigram for a certain Hekatodoros, of whom it is said that he can now 'watch the very artfully wrought gates of Olympos' (*βλέ[πε]ις δὲ Ὀλύμπου τὰς ἀ[δα]ᾳ̣λτους πύλας*).

The second largest group is that of inscriptions with names (787–913): we find lists of *stephanephoroi*, *choregoi*, *temeneitai*, and the obscure *kotarchai*. Among the texts with individual names we find an Asiarch (826), a prophet (834), and a place inscription for a *nomikos* (887).

Section IV (nos 928–943) groups together the inscriptions that were found in or near the theatre, among which we should mention no. 935, the oracular response to a group of builders (*SEG* IV 439), and no. 943 the 'Archangel inscription' (*CIG* 2895). H. publishes here finally the seating inscriptions for *aurarioi* and *neoteroi* (940a–e), which he, with characteristic generosity, had already put at the disposal of scholars. New seating inscriptions for Jews confirm that they were collectively known as the *θεοσέβιοι* (940g), and that they were supporters of the Blue faction (940h). It might have been convenient to list no. 844 (a place inscription for an *archiereia*?) and nos 898–906 (Tyche and Nike inscriptions) under the same heading. Unfortunately there is no plan of the theatre with the find spot of the seating inscriptions.

Finally, there are about sixty Christian inscriptions, most of which are fragments (959–1018). Among the other interesting texts are two building inscriptions that mention a *horoskopion* (909) and a *horologion* (908), and the remains of a Severan festival calendar (944). Detailed indices and concordances conclude this useful volume.

Faculty of Humanities, Amsterdam/Faculty of Classics, Cambridge ONNO M. VAN NIJF

J. BODEL: *Graveyards and Groves. A Study of the Lex Lucerina.* Pp. vii + 133, 3 ills, 4 pls. Cambridge, MA, 1994. *American Journal of Ancient History* 11, 1986 [1994].

J. Bodel's slender volume (only sixty-eight pages excluding appendices) comprises a detailed exposition of a Republican inscription found at Lucera in Puglia in the mid-nineteenth century. The so-called *Lex Lucerina* (*CIL* I^2 401, *CIL* IX 782, *ILS* 4912, *ILLRP* 504, etc.) is a frustrating object of study, being an inscribed stone not seen since its discovery in 1847. Not even Mommsen's efforts were sufficient to recover the stone, believed to have been built into the foundations of the Palazzo Bruno in Lucera, and so printed editions must base themselves on an unreliable copy of the original text, printed in 1861 in a local history, *Storia della città di Lucera*, by G. B. D'Amelj. Despite the unfortunate loss of the original, the text is for the most part clear enough; its interpretation, however, is what B. disputes. (The key argument is offered in abbreviated form on p. 4.)

The inscription relates to an extra-urban site, and prohibits three things: the dumping of filth (*stircus*), the depositing of dead bodies, and the performance of funerary rituals in the *loucar*. B.'s argument hinges on the interpretation of this latter term. On the basis of the word *loucar*, the

inscription was interpreted by Mommsen as a *lex sacra*—an interpretation which has generally been accepted. By contrast, B. argues that the inscription relates not to the protection of a sacred grove, but to the administration of a cemetery. B. brings in parallels from the funerary grove of Libitina on the Esquiline at Rome to assist in his interpretation of the meaning of this text, which can thus be seen to offer us a rare glimpse of social practices in mid-Republican Italy, as they relate to the funerary sphere.

The inscription must belong to a period just after the foundation of the Latin colony of Luceria in 314 B.C., making it one of the earlier complex Latin inscriptions to survive (or at least, to survive to be recorded in modern times). However, since the stone is lost, it is hard to date the inscription. B. opts for the third century (p. 3) or late fourth century B.C. (p. 67), and goes further, attempting to set the inscription into a specific historical context: he suggests that it was set up to regulate the cemetery and provide an undertaker's headquarters for the colony, following a bloody massacre around the time of its foundation (Livy 9.26) (pp. 67–8).

There are three appendices, tangentially related to the main themes of the book. The first rejects the view of Mommsen that sacred groves produced regular revenue for the state (pp. 69–71). The second discusses a funerary law, the *Lex Libitinaria* from Puteoli (*AE* 1971, 88), aiming to provide an intelligible reading of a difficult text (pp. 72–80). Dates previously proposed for this law range from the late Republican or Augustan period down to the Julio-Claudian period; B. prefers a somewhat earlier date, in the first half of the first century B.C. The third appendix discusses 'potter's fields', that is, places outside Roman towns where the corpses of the poor were disposed of at public expense (pp. 81–3).

Although there is an *index locorum* listing some literary and legal and most epigraphic sources mentioned, there is no comprehensive index of names, places, subjects, or themes. Nor is there a proper bibliography—omissions which inevitably curtail the usefulness of any book, and more particularly any work of a closely argued and technical nature, such as this.

While published in 1994, the writing was completed, the preface informs us, in 1989, and thus although the bibliography is largely complete to 1990, certain later works must now be taken into account, such as the article by S. Panciera, 'La Lex Luci Spoletina e la legislazione sui boschi sacri in età Romana', in *Monteluco e i Monti Sacri* (Spoleto, 1994), pp. 25–46. More important is the set of conference papers on *luci*—including articles by Ampolo, Coarelli, and Lejeune—published under the title *Les bois sacrés* (Naples, 1993). Nevertheless, B.'s treatment of the text is generally interesting, learned, and wide-ranging—spanning sacred groves and cemeteries, management of 'waste', and ways of regulating the suburbs of the city.

University College London FAY GLINISTER

H. Solin (ed.): *Epigrafi e studi epigrafici in Finlandia.* (Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae 19.) Pp. x + 170, ills. Rome: Institutum Romanum Finlandiae, 1998. Paper. ISBN: 951-96902-6-3.

In 1954 the Institutum Romanum Finlandiae was established on the Janiculum at Rome. It was a late addition to the collection of foreign research institutes in the city, but because of this, it was able to fill a gap in the research of its more venerable neighbours by undertaking to focus on the discipline of epigraphy—which had the additional benefit of being considerably cheaper than choosing to mount extensive archaeological digs. This volume mainly celebrates the achievements of the Institute: while there were some Finnish scholars (notably Johannes Sundwall and Herman Gummerus) who worked with inscriptions before its foundation, as S. shows in his introductory study of epigraphic research in Finland, they were few and far between.

The first director of the Institute, Henrik Zilliacus, began the tradition of assembling an *équipe* of young scholars to work together on a project. The results of their research, the *Sylloge Inscriptionum Christianarum Veterum Musei Vaticani* (Helsinki, 1963) and accompanying volumes on onomastics and biometrics by Iiro Kajanto and Henrik Nordberg, demonstrated the clear value of this collaborative principle. Zilliacus was followed by Veikko Väänänen and then Jaakko Suolahti, whose teams produced the *Graffiti del Palatino* (Helsinki, 1966–70) and *Lateres Signati Ostienses* (Rome, 1977–8) respectively. S.'s critical history ends with Suolahti, but he provides a useful, thematically divided bibliography of epigraphic work published subsequently by Finnish scholars, the scale of which demonstrates how widespread their contribution to recent epigraphic research has been.

The ongoing activity of the Institute is illustrated by three articles detailing the current and proposed work of three *équipes*: S.'s own project to produce a new edition of *CIL* X; Anne Helttula's two volumes on inscriptions from the Isola Sacra, the first updating Thylander's collection of 1952 and the second a series of commentaries on particular themes; and the current director Christer Bruun's project on the adminstration of the water supply to Rome. S.'s account of various problems encountered in the new Corpus volume is most detailed. He provides a history of epigraphic study in the area which focuses on Renaissance scholars (as the original editors of *CIL* did), especially Giocondo, Agustín, and Smetius, before skirting quickly to Mommsen: readers interested in local copyists and collectors from the area will have to wait for the edition itself. In contrast to the original editors, S. does examine classical records of inscriptions, with two examples from Pliny the Elder. There are also notes on the distribution of inscriptions and the definition of the area to be covered by the volume, a sample entry, and four previously unpublished inscriptions.

The volume also includes articles with details of the four inscriptions and epigraphic material on Finnish soil (M. Kajava), a brief note on the documentation used for *Lateres Signati Ostienses* (E. M. Steinby), and finally a previously unpublished talk given by S., 'Iscrizioni antiche di Ferentino e Alfonso Giorgi'. Rather than to Giorgi, a friend and correspondent of Mommsen and Henzen, most of this is devoted to details of inscriptions from Ferentino: six unpublished examples and three originally assigned to Frosinone which S. relocates to Ferentino on the basis of new manuscript evidence.

University College London WILLIAM STENHOUSE

C. Papageorgiadou-Banis: *The Coinage of Kea*. (*ΜΕΛΕΤΗΜΑΤΑ* 24.) Pp. viii + 108, 21 pls. Athens: National Hellenic Research Foundation, 1997. Paper. ISBN: 960-7094-94-8.

Three of the four cities on Kea (Koresia, Ioulis, and Karthaia; no coin is known for Poiessa) minted silver coins on the Aiginetan standard in the late archaic period and bronzes from the fourth to the first century B.C., most issues displaying some inter-mint coordination in type and denomination. At intervals from the fourth to the first century bronze coinage in the name of all the Keians was struck, presumably at times when the cities formed a federation, and during one of these periods Ioulis and Karthaia also produced some didrachms apparently on a reduced Attic standard. P.-B. has collected over 1000 specimens and offers the first detailed analysis of the island's coinage as a whole. She and the publishers deserve our thanks for making this rich material available in English. It is particularly gratifying that P.-B. has given bronze issues as much attention as silver, for the former are all too often neglected by numismatists.

Some of P.-B.'s interpretations, based as they are on vague stylistic comparisons often with external coinage, are open to question. See, for example, K. A. Sheedy's authoritative review article in *NC* 158 (1998), 249–57, which substantially revises P.-B.'s arrangement and dating of the bronze issues and of the didrachms, and the treatment of Keian federations by G. Reger in L. Mendoni and A. Mazarakis-Ainian (edd.), *Kea-Kythnos: History and Archaeology* (*ΜΕΛΕΤΗΜΑΤΑ* 27; Athens, 1998), pp. 633–41, which will doubtless prompt further refinements. Nevertheless her corpus and its division into issues will form the basis of research for many years to come.

P.-B. lists both obverse and reverse dies of most issues, including the bronzes, but does not illustrate all of them, not even all the obverse dies, although the plates are profligately spaced. Thus, when new specimens turn up, there will often be no means of knowing from this book whether or not they add to the number of obverse dies, i.e. to our knowledge of the mints' output. This is particularly regrettable in the case of important series like the archaic staters: three of the nine obverse dies of Koresia, and one of the four of Ioulis, are unillustrated. No attempt is made to distinguish the obverse dies of Karthaia Series I staters, a difficult task given the plainness of the type but probably not impossible, and one of the three obverse dies of the Series II staters lacks illustration. No die-study at all is given of an important series of archaic fractions with grape-bunch/incuse square (pp. 24–5, 82), apparently because its attribution to Ioulis is doubtful; nor of a series of Koresian fractions with dolphin/incuse (pp. 20, 79; *pace* P.-B. the attribution to Koresia of those with K in the incuse still seems doubtful, given the different orientation of their dolphin and the use of the single letter K instead of the doubleton ϘO). The need for adequate illustration of all dies is underlined by the fact that of the sixteen obverse dies distinguished for

the staters of all three mints, no fewer than eleven are represented by single coins: hence many more dies probably remain to be discovered, and a new hoard might transform our view of the mints. This is implicitly recognized by P.-B., p. 54 (where n. 11 seems to confuse literature about the number of coins struck per die with that about the calculation of the number of dies in a given series). It is, however, belied on p. 35, where she wonders whether the *c*. 30 surviving staters of Karthaia Series I might not be improbably copious for a Keian mint of the period, and suggests that they belong elsewhere: the logic is back to front, and in any case, as P.-B. has not provided an obverse die-study for this series, we simply do not know how big the output was likely to have been (see also Sheedy, p. 250, for restoration of these coins to Karthaia).

Similar misapprehensions seem to lie behind various judgements in the book about the effect of economic and political events on the output of coinage. Thus we learn on p. 24 about an earthquake at Koresia in 377 B.C. (no ancient or modern reference, nor mention in the book's historical introduction), and the likelihood that this dealt a severe blow to the city's economy and by implication to its output of coinage. But such disasters were at least as likely to provoke an increased output of coinage in order to pay for rebuilding work. On p. 48 P.-B. argues that the principal League coinage belongs to the second rather than the third century on the grounds that otherwise the second century would have no coinage while the third would have too much; but, as all the coinages concerned are bronze issues of modest size, they are of little economic significance and arguments based on the effect of their presence in or absence from a particular period have virtually no force.

To sum up, this slender book-of-the-thesis is of undoubted value, but would have benefited from the attention of an academic editor. And a competent copy-editor would have ironed out the innumerable typographical errors, infelicities of translation (not the least of which is the persistent use of 'metrical' for 'metrological' and 'monogram' for 'letter'—or are these errors in the original Greek?), and inconsistencies and oddities in the catalogue.

London R. H. J. ASHTON

T. BUCKLEY: *Aspects of Greek History 750–323 BC: A Source-Based Approach*. Pp. XVIII + 542, 13 maps. London and New York: Routledge, 1996. Paper. ISBN: 0-415-09958-7.

There is room for a good, up-to-date narrative history of Archaic and Classical Greece aimed at those with no previous knowledge. Beginners can find Bury and Meiggs antediluvian (*A History of Greece* [1st edn, 1900; revised 4th edn, Basingstoke and London, 1978]), Hammond not much better (*A History of Greece to 322 BC* [1st edn, 1959; 3rd edn, Oxford, 1986]), Murray a bit long in the tooth (*Early Greece* [1st edn, 1978; 2nd edn, London, 1993]), Bradley far too simplistic (*Ancient Greece: Using Evidence* [Rydalmere, 1980]), and Osborne too sophisticated for them (*Greece in the Making 1200–479 BC* [London and New York, 1996]).

B.'s book aims at a specific group of novices: A-level students doing section A of the paper (i.e. political and military rather than social, economic, and cultural history). It consists of twenty-six free-standing chapters. The first is on the main literary sources and the rest move, in rough chronological order, from colonization to Alexander's generalship. All chapters, except the first, close with a short bibliography, and there are a glossary, collected bibliography, and index at the end (on the latter two see below).

There are few factual errors. One example, however, may be the claim that Sphodrias' raid on Piraeus preceded the formation of Athens' Second League (p. 446; see below). But there are other serious problems.

B.'s subtitle is unfortunate. His use of sources is jejune. B. claims (p. 379) that Nicias knew the problems that the Athenians would face in Sicily before the expedition sailed on the basis of a speech in Thucydides (6.20–3). Similarly, B. (pp. 416–9) makes Theramenes a moderate of consistent beliefs on the basis of a speech in Xenophon (*Hellenica* 2.3.48). B., probably misled by Xenophon, ignores the evidence of Diodorus (15.28.2–4, 29.5–6) on the Sphodrias affair (above). He is unilluminating on minor sources. What will newcomers make of Eusebius the *third*-century A.D. writer (p. 120), or the bare list of 'four sources (Aristotle, Vaticanus Graecus, Philochorus, and Aelian)' (p. 145)?

Far from being 'source-based', B. usually outlines received opinions. Unfortunately, while doing so he sometimes resuscitates apparently dead debates while omitting live ones. For example, on Herodotus (pp. 12–16) we get various scholarly opinions on the unity of composition (with

only W. W. How and J. Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus vol. 2* [2nd edn, Oxford, 1928] in the bibliography), but nothing on the possible fictionality of the sources (D. Fehling, *Herodotus and his 'Sources'* [Eng. trans., Liverpool, 1989]).

B. tends to the authorial stance traditional in the text book: the pose of non-existence. On the one hand he does not tell us his conclusions on some debates (e.g. pp. 2–3, did Aristotle write the *Athenaion Politeia?*), while on the other he gives his own speculations as if they were uncontentious facts (e.g. pp. 494–6, the equipment of Alexander's troops).

The structure of the book in self-contained chapters leads to repetition and omission. In Chapter XI we are told of 'the Amphictyonic Congress (a religious league for the running of the sanctuary of Delphi but possessing political influence)' (p. 214). In the next we find 'the Amphictyonic Congress (a religious league whose function was to run the Delphic sanctuary but possessing political influence)' (p. 231). There is no clear discussion of the Second Sacred War. It is given passing mention three times (pp. 239, 276, 283), but in the often inaccurate index mentioned only once (where it is lumped together with the Third Sacred War).

The crucial problem with this book is that it is very dull. In part this stems from its aim. Military and political narratives divorced from their social and cultural contexts can be seen as boring, pointless, and inexplicable. B.'s book suffers when compared with its 'companion' *Aspects of Roman History AD 14–117* (London and New York, 1998), in which Richard Alston drops the pretension about sources and does not leave out the thematic.

The work is not helped by its style. Some may think the free-standing structure excuses repetitions between chapters (above). But to find 'the Propontis, the small sea that connects the Hellespont to the Black Sea' (p. 474) and 'the Propontis, the small sea that connects the Bosporus to the Hellespont' (p. 483) in the same chapter illustrates the quality of the prose.

The book sets itself out as 'source-based', but it is unlikely to encourage those who have not already done so to read ancient authors. It lacks anything thought-provoking comparable with the 'suggestions for further study' in the Classical World Series from Bristol Classical Press (e.g. S. C. Todd, *Athens and Sparta* [London, 1996], pp. 76–7) or even the 'assignments' in the often (and justly) derided Bradley (op. cit.).

In conclusion, people who knew nothing about the ancient world would learn quite a lot from this book, but it must be doubted that they would want to read another on the subject.

St Hugh's College, Oxford HARRY SIDEBOTTOM

P. BRUN: *Les archipels égéens dans l'antiquité grecque (V^e–II^e siècles av. notre ère)*. (Institut des Sciences et Techniques de l'Antiquité, Centre de Recherches d'Histoire Ancienne, 157.) Pp. 251, 9 pls, 5 maps. Annales Littéraires de l'Université de Franche-Comté, 1996. Paper. ISBN: 2-251-60616-5.

Far from being 'zones of misery' (p. 5), the islands of the Aegean boasted *poleis* where the population was more or less in balance with the environment supporting it (pp. 119, 163). This 'optimum demographic state' had been reached by many in the fourth century B.C. (p. 220). Rome transformed conditions in the Aegean from around the turn of the third and second centuries B.C. Ancient sources can be misleading (but not Isoc. 4.132 on mountain cultivation, p. 68 n. 26), especially during the Imperial period (p. 202). Later travellers (pp. 210–16) and occasionally modern observers also misrepresent the islands' former glories: B. criticizes Rackham's description of Amorgos as barren (p. 183 with n. 1).

B. seeks to rehabilitate our view of island life in the Classical and Hellenistic periods. He achieves this by studying the islands' geography and climate (Chapter I), agriculture and countryside (Chapters II–III), natural and commercial resources (Chapter IV), and the human economies of the islands' populations (Chapter 5). The crux of B's. argument lies in the discussion of the richness and poverty of the islands, subtitled 'the paradox of insularity' (Chapter VI). The Athenian Tribute Lists (ATL) supply the most central evidence, and B. tackles issues similar to those treated by Nixon and Price in *The Greek City* (Oxford, 1990). The reassessment of tribute in 425/4 B.C. marked a long overdue opportunity for the Athenians to renegotiate the allies' tribute in light of the years of prosperity which the islands had enjoyed under the mantle of the Empire. The tribute was neither exorbitant (p. 192) nor was it

dictated by the Athenians; reassessment was a bilateral process, as suggested by ML 69, ll. 21–2 (p. 190 n. 15).

B. anticipates interesting questions about the complex interrelationships between the islands and the mainland but never really delivers clear answers. We gain some basic idea of the hierarchies that existed among the island *poleis* based on ATL (p. 188, Table 3) and are offered three demographic levels to rank each population: <1000, <5000+, and >10000 (p. 161). Various examples are used to illustrate how the Aegean is a complex and dynamic world (p. 159), but the interconnections of those dynamics are not brought out fully. The next best thing to a theory is the suggestion that initially an island's horizons are limited to the neighbouring islands until it grows in importance; then geographic perspective shifts to regions where an island's position and interests guide it (p. 169).

I am left asking what the distinctive characteristics of an island *polis* are, if any? Their insularity forces populations to look to maritime commerce, a direction which B. suggests might have been a response to population increase (p. 174). But would not most *poleis* with a harbour seek out such opportunities? How do we best go about explaining and illustrating the complex economic interrelationships of the Greek *poleis*? B. criticizes rightly the concentration on the more extraordinary *poleis* of Sparta and Athens. Greek *poleis* differ in size and resources; they may have distinctive microregional features, but they also operate on a wider stage, both regional (as Reger has argued for Delos) and international. These concerns overlap and are sometimes nested within each other. The challenge remains for the historian of the ancient Greek economy to explain clearly and comprehensively such complexities.

University of Liverpool G. J. OLIVER

J. D. GRAINGER: *A Seleukid Prosopography and Gazetteer*. Pp. xxii + 818, 2 tables, 4 maps. Leiden, New York, and Cologne: E. J. Brill, 1998. Cased, $206. ISBN: 90-04-10799-1.

The purpose of this volume is to provide researchers with a substantial body of information on the Seleukid dynasty, its known officials, courtiers, and subjects, and on places and institutions. Grainger admits that the project was an ambitious one and acknowledges that errors and omissions will thus be made (p. xvi). This is a major problem with such works; perhaps a database would be a more suitable and less static medium for such prosopographical and bibliographical information. There is much of value included, and the volume may be of benefit to scholars working on Seleukid or Hellenistic history, but it should be used with care.

In the section on kings and courtiers, the bibliography is not complete, the result being a rather one-sided view of the Seleukid dynasty founded on G.'s own work, with no reference, for example, to the important contribution of Sherwin-White and Kuhrt. It is worrying that little work published since 1991 is accounted for in what should be an up-to-date work of reference.

A major portion of the book is devoted to a list of subjects of the kings. These are simply names; we know nothing about them and are unlikely ever to know more. Although history may be made by individuals as is claimed, the relevance of some 270 pages of such names must be called into question, and the fact that there are omissions further weakens a substantial part of the book. This may be the nature of prosopography, but mistakes and bibliographical omissions in other sections of the work cause concern.

Only a small selection of these can be offered here; indeed, it would be invidious and pointless to mention all. There is hardly a full list of ancient sources for Antiocheia-in-Persis (p. 683); the section on Ai Khanoum (p. 677) is worryingly thin for this most important archaeological site; and a section on Memphis does not mention the definitive book by Crawford. Such important ancient sites deserve more attention and accuracy.

The same applies to the gazetteer, which contains a number of mistakes of geography. For example, Mesopotamia (p. 751) stretches much further to the south of the Armenian mountains than G. suggests, and in this and his account of Babylonia (p. 699) he makes no allowance for territorial changes throughout the long history of the dynasty. The maps are neither complete or full enough—many places covered in the gazetteer do not appear, and provinces, such as Aria, should have been included.

While the author's intentions are laudable, and while it is certain that errors and omissions are made in such works, there are too many in this volume to inspire great confidence. Where the

information in some cases is interesting and valuable for researchers, most is not full or accurate enough, the sum of which is a disappointing book.

University of Warwick COLIN ADAMS

R. GANCI: *Uno* Ktisma*, tre memorie storiche: Il caso di Reggio*. (Supplementi a *Kókalos*, 13.) Pp. 158. Rome: Giorgio Bretschneider, 1998. Paper, L. 190,000. ISBN: 88-7689-153-6.

In this doctoral thesis, Ganci analyses a very specific set of memories recorded in ancient authors concerning the ethnic groups involved in the foundation of Rhegium. The aims of this analysis are several: to unravel the historiographical traditions found in the ancient histories, particularly of Strabo and Pausanias; to assess whether or not there was any real historical–temporal relation between Messenians and Chalcidians at the time of the foundation of Rhegium; and to contextualize chronologically these unravelled traditions and layers of memories with other literary, numismatic, epigraphic, and archaeological material in order to illustrate how myths of foundation were developed through time and how they functioned within the history of the Messenian Straits.

G. structures the work into three sections which trace different ethnic threads running through the recollections of foundation—Messenian, Siceliote/Magna Graecian, and Chalcidian. Each section both carries out historiographical enquiry and suggests a context and explanation for particular representations of the myth of origin, often influenced by current political and propaganda needs. Thus the first section deconstructs Pausanias' confused account of the Messenian involvement at Rhegium, and indicates that such confusion was not just Pausanian error, but also the result of intentional propaganda by Anaxilas to legitimate his own tyrannical position in the fifth century. It conjectures that *in reality* there were at least two waves of Messenian involvement (at foundation and in the fifth century), and highlights the likelihood of an Eretrian rôle, perhaps under Chalcidian compulsion, in the initial foundation. The second section analyses Strabo (6.1.6), attributing the implication of the Zanclean foundation of Rhegium and his Messenian *excursus* to Antiochus of Syracuse. Both stories are contextualized as part of the political struggles for dominance in the first thirty years of the fifth century B.C., the former at the moment of Gelan/Samian success in controlling Zancle and commerce in the Straits, the latter a Syracusan ploy to support the rights of the sons of Anaxilas to succeed to the tyranny. It also analyses the possible contexts of the appointment of Anaxilas as tyrant and highlights Rhegine domination of the area under him. The third section considers the source of the Strabonian tradition which indicates a purely Chalcidian foundation independent of Messenian involvement. This simplification of earlier foundation stories is attributed to the oligarchy at Rhegium that attempted to distance itself from the preceding tyranny and its Messenian connections.

By the very nature of the ongoing development of these memories of origin, the different threads overlap and are not so neatly separated as the structure imposed may suggest. In fact, although the sections are presented as thematic, the overall structure is also broadly chronological. Thus it moves from issues of early foundation, to power struggles in the first half of the fifth century, to the simplification and normalization of the story in the post-tyranny period.

Though the thesis carefully focuses on a compact body of evidence, it is not just a history of the foundation of Rhegium. Analysis of these myths results in a study of the seventh–fifth century B.C. historical developments in the Straits and reveals the variety of local (Rhegine, Zanclean, Gelan, Locrian, Syracusan) and supralocal (Persian, Athenian, Messenian, Samian) players involved in the politics of this area, vital for control of a trade route between East and West. It also touches upon wider issues, reassessing interpretations of the chronology of the Messenian *ethnos* in the West, of the dating of the Lelantine War, and of the number and nature of the Spartan–Messenian Wars.

Whilst all her conclusions may not be irrefutable, G.'s thorough approach to the unravelling of the historiographical traditions behind Strabo and Pausanias, and clever integration of these myths with other forms of evidence, results in a convincing thesis which builds upon a strong Italian academic tradition, characterized by the works of Ettore Lepore and Domenico Musti. The example may be specific, but the work does make a worthy contribution to current ancient

historical concern to understand the development of concepts of origin and identity in the ancient world and the ongoing function of myths as part of history.

Brasenose College, Oxford ANGELA POULTER

P. SIMELON: *La propriété en Lucanie depuis les Gracques jusqu'à l'avènement des Sévères.* (Collection Latomus 220.) Pp. 216, 5 maps. Brussels: Latomus, 1993. Paper, Belg. frs. 1100. ISBN: 2-87031-16-5.

This is a book marked more by industry than by thought, beginning with the topic: the approach is ruthlessly epigraphical, without direct contact with the archaeological material, and the evidence is simply inadequate to allow any useful discussion. Even the industry is sometimes lacking: it is not acceptable to check *AE* up to 1983 for a book published in 1993. The decision to have an index of sources without page references is quite bizarre. One wonders also whether S. knows who Porphyrion was or has simply taken the references over without checking; and whether he thinks that *The Roman World* is a periodical. The Taranto congresses are sometimes cited by number, sometimes by title. More seriously, S. is completely unaware of the problems of epigraphical statistics, neither citing nor—evidently—reading so obvious a piece as Greg Woolf's in *PBSR* (1990). As a result, it does not seem to have occurred to S. (p. 39 n. 196) that one cannot without more ado compare the incidence of *actores* from areas where there is a volume of *Inscriptiones Italiae*, particularly one systematically explored by Vincenzo Bracco, and areas where there is only *CIL*. We are offered absurd statistics on slaves (pp. 20–5) and on 'families' (Tableau III). (By p. 78, S. is aware of the impossibility of equating *gens* and family, but has proceeded blissfully unaware from p. 28 onwards.) The account of the natural resources of Lucania is naive, and S. appears to know the area from maps, not from the ground. Nor do I understand how S. could produce such a bland account of the problems of Forum Anni (p. 20) if he had really read the works of Peter Wiseman which appear in his bibliography; or write what he does about the Liber Coloniarum (p. 58) if he had really read Lawrence Keppie's *Colonisation and Veteran Settlement.* There is no reason at all to suppose that the men referred to on p. 50 n. 254 sold wine.

The Latin word order presupposed by the suggestion on pp. 22 n. 99 and 39 n. 144 is unlikely, to say the least. There is a real problem as to how the lower valleys of the Sinni, Agri, Cavone, Basento, and Bradano, which appear to have been without organized communities under the Empire, were owned and administered; three lines on p. 19 do not provide an answer.

University College London M. H. CRAWFORD

L. GARLAND: *Byzantine Empresses. Women and Power in Byzantium AD 527–1204*. Pp. xix + 343, map, plates, tables. London and New York: Routledge, 1999. Cased, £50. ISBN: 0-415-14688-7.

There is a long tradition within Byzantine studies of books about Byzantine empresses which work as a series of biographical essays. Lynda Garland's book is the most recent. G. covers the period 527–1204 through a series of thirteen biographical chapters. These take in the empresses Theodora, wife of Justinian, Sophia, Martina, Irene, Theodora, wife of Theophilos, the wives of Leo VI, Theophano, Zoe, Theodora, sister of Zoe, Eudokia Makrembolitissa, Alexios I's empresses, Maria of Antioch, and Euphrosyne Doukaina. The chapters follow the same pattern: a biographical account of the life of each of the women, in which the emphases fall primarily on personalities. G.'s research is considerable, involving a comprehensive study of primary sources and wide secondary reading. This is good, solid work which brings together source material into a form of biographical cohesion. It is probably the nearest we can ever come to the life-histories of these women.

Nevertheless, there are some problems inherent in this approach. The question of whether this sort of biographical cohesion is justified by the sources is not fully dealt with. For instance, in her account of Theodora the wife of Justinian, G. makes the reader aware of the problems raised by the nature of Prokopios' *Secret History*, yet that awareness is not built in to her use of that source, which tends to be used uncritically. This issue of the biases of sources—why they tell it as they

do—is an area that might have been explored further. G. also takes a very limited approach to the visual material she employs. Pictures are used to illustrate points rather than for what they say. An image from the twelfth-century manuscript, the Madrid Skylitzes, is used to portray the ninth-century empress Theodora worshipping icons. If an art historian was to use a twelfth-century text to show how the ninth century worked, historians would throw a fit, and rightly so; the same is true in reverse. Byzantine images do not simply illustrate; they also encapsulate ideology. G. links the Theodora mosaic panel from San Vitale to Prokopios' description of her; she does not discuss it in any other context or appear aware of what the image tells us about attitudes to Theodora, to empresses, and to women.

G. is also prone to chatty, occasionally bland and superficial, speculations. 'It was [Irene's] misfortune to rely on eunuchs' (p. 92). Why is this a misfortune rather than a sign of Irene's methods of retaining power? 'Sophia's most marked characteristic was her love of power' (p. 56); well, no more so than any other ruler in Byzantium.

What G.'s book does not do is provide an analysis of Byzantine empresses and the question of women and power in Byzantium. Her introduction makes it sound as if all imperial titles retained the same meanings across time and as if the rôle of empress was essentially unchanging and universal. Barbara Hill's work on Komnenian empresses has shown very clearly that neither supposition is correct. Nor, despite the subtitle of her book, is G. concerned with any of the growing body of material on queenship in the Middle Ages. A considerable amount of work has been undertaken by scholars such as Janet Nelson, Pauline Stafford, and John Carmi Parsons discussing what it meant to be a female ruler in medieval society, a woman with power in a misogynistic society where 'powerful woman' was a contradiction in terms. Such conceptualizations, which consider issues of gender and power outside the realm of the straightforwardly personal (if such a thing can exist), do not seem to be G.'s aim. Rather, she offers us a solid, readable guide to personalities and actions, a mine of useful and informative material.

University of Sussex LIZ JAMES

B. Rémy: *Dioclétien et la tétrarchie*. (Que sais-je? 3418.) Pp. 127, ills. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1998. Paper. ISBN: 2-13-049545-1.

This short, densely written volume aims to present the reader with a basic narrative of Diocletian's reign, together with a survey of tetrarchic political institutions, not only under Diocletian himself, but also in the period down to the death of Galerius in 311. It is arranged into nine chapters, flanked by an introduction (dealing with the different types of sources) and a conclusion, with a brief bibliography also provided. The material is generally arranged in a thematic fashion, with chapters on, *inter alia*, municipal administration, economic reforms, military affairs, and religion. Each chapter is divided up into tightly focused blocks and frequently the data (such as that on coin types at p. 81) are arranged as a descriptive list. Throughout, detailed references are given in the text, mainly to the ancient sources (including coins, inscriptions, and papyri), but also to a number of modern works. R. is to be commended for presenting so much ancient material to his readers: well chosen texts provide vivid testimony of social conditions and aspirations in the tetrarchic period (that on senatorial careers at pp. 54–6 is particularly felicitous). He is also scrupulous in sketching the modern debates, such as at pp. 89–90, where the old orthodoxy of Luttwak's 'grand strategy' is juxtaposed with the critiques of Whittaker and Isaac. In general, R.'s Diocletian emerges as a man driven less by ideology than by pragmatism.

At times, the author reveals some quintessentially French obsessions. The discussion of traditional Roman religion (pp. 100–1), for example, concentrates almost exclusively on Gallic and north African material—but considering the book's target audience, this is hardly unexpected. Indeed, R.'s assessments are more often judicious than not.

The volume is well printed, while the photographs (of coins) are crisply reproduced (and, to the credit of both author and publisher, they are provided with a scale). In general, R. has given francophone students an admirably succinct and up-to-date account of the tetrarchic period. I only wish that more British and American publishers would produce similarly excellent introductory volumes. One series that attempts to do a similar job has recently come in for scathing criticism in this journal (*CR* 49.1 [1999], 286–7). The high standard of R.'s volume seems to me to present a model of what most usefully can be done within a very short compass. Readers

of this journal might be interested to know that a companion 'Que sais-je?' volume on Constantine, by Bertrand Lançon, is now also available. Here too the superior virtues of these French introductions over most of their English-language counterparts are admirably displayed.

National University of Ireland, Maynooth MARK HUMPHRIES

L. Polverini (ed.): *Erudizione e antiquaria a Perugia nell'Ottocento*. (Incontri Perugini di Storia della Storiografia Antica e sul Mondo Antico 5.) Pp. 400, 43 ills. Naples: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane, 1998. Paper, L. 55,000. ISBN: 88-8114-672-X.

There are published here in part the proceedings of a conference held in 1990 (for the five missing papers see pp. 11 and 382), devoted in the first instance to the careers and papers of Giovanni Battista Vermiglioli, Ariodante Fabretti, and Giancarlo Conestabile della Staffa, all involved with the study of the antiquities of their native city. The volume is pleasingly reasonable in price; but it would have been better to make it slightly more expensive and avoid the truly dreadful reproductions of the material illustrating L. Sensi's article on the archaeological activity of M. Guardabassi. There is also material on R. Garrucci and G. B. Rossi Scotti. Of the three principal figures, only Fabretti worked in a major way on material from outside Perugia, earning a well-deserved reputation for his work on the long road towards the comprehension of Italian epigraphic texts in languages other than Latin and Greek. The letters from and to Guardabassi, published by G. Asdrubali Pentiti, are accompanied by excellent annotation; the Vermiglioli, Fabretti, and Conestabile correspondence, published by M. F. Perotti and C. Ferone, appears in the nude. There is an index of proper names, but no index of manuscripts, which it would be normal scholarly procedure to supply in a volume of this kind. In general, there seems to have been little attempt to get to grips with the manuscript material left by the men who form the subject of the volume: there is a brief reference to a manuscript of Fabretti, *Iscrizioni antiche d'Italia* (Perugia, Biblioteca Augusta, MS 2225), on p. 74, but no discussion here or on p. 35 of its relation to Fabretti's published work. One has the impression that all of the men are being looked at from the outside, rather than through their work; a pity, for they were in their different ways crucial to the nineteenth-century revolution associated with the name of Theodor Mommsen.

University College London M. H. CRAWFORD

M. C. Spadoni: *Reate. II. L'Antiquaria*. Pp. 160. Pisa and Rome: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali, 1998. Paper. ISBN: 88-8147-144-2.

The 1992 *Reate* of M. C. Spadoni (Cerrini) and A.M. Reggiani Massarini has now been followed by the former's account of the antiquarian sources on which the earlier work was in part based. A general chapter on the earlier period is followed by chapters on Mariano Vittori, Pompeo Angelotti, and Loreto Mattei, a chapter on the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries by one on Michele Michaeli. This volume is, like the first, a fine achievement, setting out to understand the figures with which it is concerned as a whole and not simply excavating their lives for archaeological information. It also rightly emphasizes (p. 69) that 'marking' scholars of an earlier generation by how they measure up to modern scholarly criteria is wholly unhistorical. That said, it is right to observe that it is Mariano Vittori (1518–72) who contributed most to the enterprise of *CIL*. A résumé of his *De antiquitatibus Reatis* largely occupies pp. 36–55. It is a pity that the work has no index, which might have profitably included an alphabetical list of the sources used by Vittori. The book might also usefully have been provided with more in the way of cross-referencing: the rather hasty account of Reginald Pole and Giovanni Morone (both of whom Vittori served, coming to England with the former) is superseded by that on pp. 22–3; and p. 33 n. 61 = p. 29 n. 54. It also seems rather hard to describe L. Mummius, a consul elected by the Roman people, as a *condottiero* (p. 42). There is one more substantive point to be made: S. announces on p. 9 that the 'Silloge Signoriliana' of Cola di Rienzo included an inscription of Cures; not only is this attribution (to be found also in

G. Purpura, 'Sulla . . . lex de auctoritate Vespasiani', in *Minima Epigraphica et Papyrologica* II) without foundation; Peter Spring also demonstrated in his Edinburgh thesis, *The Topographical and Archaeological Study of the Antiquities of the City of Rome, 1420–1477* (1972), that the 'Silloge Signoriliana' was as much the work of Poggio as the 'Silloge Poggiana'.

University College London M. H. CRAWFORD

M. Van De Mieroop: *Cuneiform Texts and the Writing of History*. Pp. vi + 196, 6 pls. London and New York: Routledge, 1999. Paper, £13.99. ISBN: 0-415-19533-0.

I would imagine that for most classical historians cuneiform inscriptions are a closed book or, perhaps more accurately, a closed clay envelope. As Professor Van De Mieroop points out (pp. 118–19), even as distinguished a practitioner of the art as the late Moses Finley tended to stay clear of the Near East in his writings. Yet, as he also points out, cuneiform was the dominant writing system of the region for half its recorded history (p. 38). The author's aim therefore is (p. 2) 'to show the riches of source material available to the historian provided by this record'. He does this in five brief chapters. The first categorizes the documents according to type, e.g. administrative documents, letters, etc. The second chapter deals with élites or, as it is dubbed, 'history from above', and the various approaches which may be made to their study. Particularly interesting is M.'s autopsy of Saragon of Agade. Next we tackle the writing of history from below, and the author frankly admits the difficulties here due to the material at our disposal. We find the common people 'only in the records drawn up by the institutions with which they interacted' (p. 87). With the chapter on economic history the cuneiform sources come into their own, since the system 'was developed for the purpose of recording economic transactions' (p. 106). The author first considers theoretical approaches to the Mesopotamian economy and then one example of economic activity drawn from the twenty-first century when the Kingdom of Ur ruled southern Babylonia. The last chapter deals with the fashionable topic of gender and Mesopotamian history. Again here, after a theoretical discussion, the author considers the position of women in Mesopotamia and 'how it was particular to that culture' (p. 138).

I think it can be said that M. has indeed fulfilled his promise to show us the riches of the material he works with. In his clear and lucid treatment we do indeed catch a glimpse of a world with which most of us will be unfamiliar. The book may be recommended to anybody who wishes to acquaint himself with the contents of cuneiform and how they form a basis for the writing of history.

Darwin College, University of Kent at Canterbury ARTHUR KEAVENEY

T. Eide, T. Hägg, R. H. Pierce, L. Török (edd.): *Fontes Historiae Nubiorum, Vol. III. Textual Sources for the History of the Middle Nile Region between the Eighth Century BC and the Sixth Century AD: From the First to the Sixth Century AD*. Pp. 751–1216. Bergen: University of Bergen, 1998. Paper, NOK 220. ISBN: 82-91626-07-3.

This third volume of FHN continues in much the same careful and meticulous fashion as the two earlier ones and the collection shows every sign of becoming a standard work for many years to come.

This volume contains previously unpublished Coptic material from Qasr Ibrim relating to the fifth century and a number of Meroitic inscriptions, but a large proportion of the volume is literary material drawn from the Graeco-Roman world. Not only is this material familiar, and perhaps less interesting in the context of this collection; it also presents considerable difficulties of interpretation. Firstly, a quibble: the editors have adopted a policy of grouping material either by the date of the source or sometimes the source's source, or, if these dates are unknown, by the date of events referred to. This creates minor anomalies in, for example, the dispersal of texts relating to events in the third century across the latter half of the volume. The editors' careful and

scholarly introductions tend to the philological rather than the historical and offer little coherent guidance as to how to treat this material, though their reluctance is understandable. What, for instance, should happen to Heliodoros' *Aithiopika* (274)? The editors reprint three passages with elaborate warnings as to their historicity, but the fact that some 'notions may be regarded as authentic' (p. 1048) should not distract from the essentially fantastic nature of the tale. This is a relatively clear case, but in reprinting the so-called *Blemmyomachia* (326) attempts to relate this fragment of epic poetry to historical events are surely misconceived. And then there are the panegyrics (278–80). Having Blemmyes quake before the emperor or comparing their ferocity to the cultured values of an emperor are obvious rhetorical topoi and, as when Augustan poets had Britons and Scythians fear Augustus' imperialistic designs, tell us nothing of the peoples beyond the frontier, except that they are remote. Even 'respectable' historical sources may be caught in the fog of this rhetoric. To return to events of the late third century, Egypt underwent a certain political and economic dislocation *c*. 250, in the Palmyrene episode (A.D. 267–72), and in the 290s. This period also sees a number of literary references to Blemmyes and warfare in Upper Egypt. The editors regard the *Historia Augusta* on Firmus and Aurelian (283) as 'probably largely fictitious', whereas the story of the Blemmyes' seizure of Koptos and Ptolemais (284 and 323) is taken seriously. The period of disruption culminates in two revolts, and Diocletian's reorganization of the frontier and the settlement of Nubians in key areas (beyond the frontier?), to restore security. The coincidence of domestic political disruption and Blemmyes' assaults gives pause for thought. How much of this is internal violence blamed on outsiders or opportunistic barbarians helping themselves during the Empire's troubles?

The value of this collection lies not, however, in its literary material but in the documentary evidence. The Dodecaschoenus was a zone of interaction between North and South and it is often argued that the continuation of pagan worship (until the eventual sixth-century conversion of the area which is attested in various inscriptions noting the Christianization of temples) results from a desire to retain institutions which encouraged communication between North and South, though, on reflection, this seems a rather unlikely explanation. Pragmatism is not normally seen as characteristic of the religious authorities of fourth- and fifth-century Egypt. The level of interaction between North and South may perhaps be somewhat underplayed since, for instance, many Roman soldiers worshipped at the temple of Mandoulis at Talmis and their inscriptions (not in this collection) stood alongside those attesting a Meroitic presence. Nevertheless, it is not respect for tradition that emerges from perhaps the most quoted of texts concerning Talmis, an order from the *strategos* to drive pigs from the temple complex (248). This is seen as evidence of an 'appalling' and 'scandalous neglect', and much is made of the Egyptian elements in the name of the *strategos* (p. 978), though the order is to drive the pigs from the village, not just the temple, perhaps suggesting a greater complexity to the situation than has hitherto been assumed.

Most of the texts are generated by North–South interaction along the Nile and, although this was certainly an important aspect of Nubian culture, there is little material to illuminate internal developments or other influences. Yet, this is a period of some importance. Meroe disappears and the Blemmyes and Nubians emerge as competing powers. A victory inscription of Aeizanas (298) shows distinct similarities with other and much earlier celebrations of Meroitic victories by enumerating the livestock seized from presumably a pastoralist tribe in the region. Yet instead of using hieroglyphics, the text is in Greek. It suggests both unsurprising economic continuity (given the harsh environment of the area) and cultural change. The texts again frequently hint at the involvement of the Blemmyes in trade with Arabia, but Arabian cultural influence is not represented in the textual material.

Reconstructing the history of Nubia from these texts is almost impossible. King Silko's inscription (317) is probably the best illustration of relations between Nubians and Blemmyes, but no narrative history of Nubia emerges. For that, we have to return to the archaeology.

Royal Holloway, London RICHARD ALSTON

H. J. Gehrke, A. Möller (edd.): *Vergangenheit und Lebenswelt: Soziale Kommunikation, Traditionsbildung und historisches Bewusstsein*. (ScriptOralia 90.) Pp. x + 390. Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 1996. DM 148. ISBN: 3-8233-5400-0.

This well-organized and integrated collection of essays issues from a conference held in

Freiburg in 1995. The theme of the volume is announced in the title: 'Past and Social Context'. 'Social Context' is my very approximate translation of *Lebenswelt*, a central concept in the critical tradition of Phenomenology. The word might be less economically rendered as 'the experiential world of individuals or groups'. Phenomenology begins from the position that 'facts' are to be set aside in favor of 'appearances', phenomena: this is the so-called phenomenological reduction. Phenomenological criticism is not directed at an objective world, alienated from consciousness, but rather at things-as-presented-to-consciousness in the transaction of perception. On the one hand, consciousness shapes and organizes 'reality'. On the other hand, consciousness is itself a product of its relations with the objects of its perception. *Lebenswelt* is a shorthand for both sides of the coin—the world as it is constituted by and as it constitutes consciousness.

Early practitioners of Phenomenology, such as Husserl, were chiefly interested in the consciousness of the individual. Successors have tended to see the *Lebenswelt* more in terms of groups: society and institutions. Contributors to this volume uniformly see the *Lebenswelt* as a reflection of larger historical trends. Jürgen Habermas is frequently cited for the theoretical justification of this generalization of the subjective field of the *Lebenswelt*; Reinhard Koselleck for the implications of Phenomenology for historiography. Jan Assmann's work on Egypt is seen by many of the contributors as an exemplary application of the theory to a historical context.

The editors have asked contributors to examine how particular societies have conceived of the idea of the past, and how this conception has shaped the nature of the group. The approach taken is properly comparative (cf. Gehrke's conclusion). A broad range of essays has been solicited, illustrating the variety of ancient Mediterranean societies. One wonders why the examples are limited in this way: why not include, say, China or India? Most contributors have taken the theme of the volume to heart and have focused on the conception of the past; several have written more generally about 'social norms'. Most essays deal with one particular area or period; a few attempt to compare conceptions of the past (or other things) across cultural or temporal lines (e.g. the essays by V. Fadinger or B. Patzek). Several disciplines are represented. Most essays can be characterized as historical or philological. Literary criticism and archaeology are also represented among the contributors.

The volume contains sixteen essays. The editors, Möller and Gehrke, provide respectively a methodological introduction and a summary conclusion. The first four essays are concerned with the ancient Near East and Israel. Of these I would mention J. Renger's impressive collection of representations of 'the past event' in the Mesopotamian civilizations. R. Bembeck attempts to outline a method (which owes much to Koselleck) for deciphering conceptions of time from material remains (highly stimulating if unconvincing). There follow six essays on ancient Greece. There is something here for everyone, though I profited most from V. Fadinger's contrast of the contextual meaning of the idea of justice in the legislation of Solon and ancient Egypt. B. Patzek's essay contrasting the understanding of women in Homer by the audiences of the archaic period and later of democratic Athens also deserves attention. S. Hansen contributes a theoretical piece on the conception of the past implied by ancient dedicatory offerings, which might well be read after the introduction and conclusion, as a general introduction to the collection. Finally there are four essays on Rome. The proposition of the collection is that people make their own pasts, and that this vision of the past in turn plays a crucial part in determining the identity of the people. The point is perhaps best illustrated by Roman historiography, and the two (to some extent overlapping) essays by D. Timpe and K.-J. Hölkeskamp are entirely persuasive. The title of G. Woolf's piece on 'the uses of forgetfulness' in late antique Gaul promises to problematize the idea of memory, which is simply taken for granted by most contributors. Execution falls short of expectations, but it is still an important and interesting piece.

Overall, the quality of the research is high. In only one or two cases did I feel that old interpretive wine was being repackaged in new theoretical bottles. Almost without exception the authors have written at an appropriate level of generality, and have attempted to deal with the central problem proposed by the editors. This collection will be useful to specialists and accessible to generalists. Both will find it interesting. I recommend it warmly.

Cowell College, University of California, Santa Cruz CHARLES W. HEDRICK JR

D. KEYS: *Catastrophe. An Investigation into the Origins of the Modern World*. Pp. xvi + 368, maps. London: Century, 1999. Cased, £16.99. ISBN: 0-7126-8069-1.

David Keys, an archaeological journalist best known for his work for *The Independent*, spent four years investigating the collapse of the civilizations of the ancient world—not just the transformation of the Graeco-Roman Mediterranean, but also the massive changes which occurred in northern Europe, the Americas, the Far East, and central Russia after the mid-sixth century. No individual could master the different scholarly disciplines, and K. has financed a team of experts to advise on historical, cultural, climatic, biological, and geophysical aspects.

K.'s thesis is simple: a massive volcanic explosion in Indonesia, a proto-Krakatoa but several times its magnitude, can be traced in ice cores from Greenland and the Antarctic, while its noise was recorded in Chinese annals; this created a volcanic winter, as the sun was dimmed for 18 months (recorded by Syriac and Chinese authors), with dramatic consequences as sensitive ecological balances were upset in Central Africa, the Russian steppes, and the Pacific basin. The African episode had the most immediate impact on the Mediterranean as the population dynamics of one of the world's major plague reservoirs, located in Kenya and Tanzania, were disrupted to produce a second eruption, this time of rodents infested with plague-bearing fleas. The consequences are history, for the urban world of classical antiquity and for relations between settled communities and nomads or transhumants.

Climatic change has been suggested before as the cause of the decline of the ancient world, but has never managed to overcome the objections that humans are sufficiently adaptable to cope with gradual change and that any overall cooling or heating of, say, the Mediterranean area will produce as many winners as losers in agricultural terms so that one should not expect to see major consequences. The merit of K.'s approach is to identify an instantaneous, even if short-lived, change and then to pursue its ramifications. Once bubonic plague reached Alexandria in 541 there was nothing to stop its intermittent ravages in Europe and the Levant over the next two centuries; once grazing patterns in the Russian steppes were dislocated, the Avars were pushed westwards into Europe for good and the Turks emerged as the major power in central Asia; once complex hydrological systems, in central America, China, or Arabia, were damaged by freak weather, societies were less able to tolerate the normal fluctuations with which they had once coped.

K. writes as a journalist, which may dismay purists. He also pushes his thesis to the limits, and in peripheral areas such as the British Isles experts may not be taken by the suggestion that an Indonesian volcano was responsible for England's conception as a country. But his discussion of the Justinianic Plague and its effects elucidates many aspects which would otherwise have escaped the professional historians. Above all, one should welcome this enthusiastic attempt to demonstrate to the public the excitement and relevance of our professional studies, since K. firmly plugs his thesis into contemporary debates about ecological balances and volcanic instability.

University of Warwick MICHAEL WHITBY

MICHAEL J. BENNETT: *Belted Heroes and Bound Women. The Myth of the Homeric Warrior-King*. Pp. xviii + 228, 4 ills, 7 pls. Lanham, Boulder, New York, and Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield, 1997. Cloth, $62.50 (Paper, $23.95). ISBN: 0-8226-3060-5 (0-8226-3061-3 pbk).

Not since Alice mistook Humpty Dumpty's cravat for a belt has there been a discussion of waistbands as imaginative as this. It starts ordinarily enough, with a previously unpublished bronze belt (Thessaly, 725–675 B.C.) and fibula (Attica or Boeotia, 750–700 B.C.) in the Harvard University Art Museums, but goes on to construct a set of extraordinary theories about the meaning of their decoration and the symbolism of belt-wearing in early Greece.

'I suggest that the decorative schema on the belt parallels the chronological framework and thematic elements of an earlier, oral (textless) *Iliad*, to which our *Iliad* still bears structural resemblance' (p. 17). The four scenes on its outside (wheel–horse–horse–wheel) and the five 'banded zones' of vertical lines which separate these scenes are said to correspond to the eight

days and one night covered in Books 2–23 of the *Iliad*. The 'wheels of life' represent the grand burials on the second and the penultimate days of this part of the story, while the horses match the entries into battle of two great heroes, Paris and Hector (an identification based on Homer's use of horse-similes in these contexts, pp. 20–1). Since Paris is unsuccessful, 'his' horse is shown upside down and has its eyes closed—the latter feature is not as self-evident to me as it is to B.—while the victorious Hector's horse has its eyes open and is the right way up. On the inside of the belt, pairs of fish, deer, lions, lions, and fish, also separated by banded zones, offer the pictorial equivalent of Homeric similes.

All this is ingenious and superficially attractive, but too arbitrary to command conviction. Paris makes two entries in the *Iliad* on the first day of battle, whereas the upside-down horse appears in the zone which ought to correspond to the second day, an inconvenient fact which B. glosses over in a couple of baffling sentences (p. 23). More fundamentally, there is no justification for reading the outside of the belt according to one set of conventions and the inside according to another. If we take the pattern of figured scenes alternating with banded zones on one side as a chronological sequence, we should apply the same principle to the same pattern on the other side, rather than declare this 'timeless' (p. 35). And if the horses and wheels on the outside represent particular narrative episodes, what basis do we have for assuming that the fish, deer, and lions on the inside represent merely generic similes?

B.'s interpretation of the Harvard fibula posits yet another iconographic convention. The fibula, he argues quite persuasively, shows the stages of the journey of the sun across the sky, with the emphasis very much on the *middle* scene, the sun at noon, 'a crucial moment of divine decision'. B. believes that the same convention of a crucial central image applies to the belt, where the middle zone should correspond to the night of the embassy to Achilles in the *Iliad* ('Achilles decides whether to rejoin the fighting. Achilles plays god', p. 36). He does not tell us why the artist, in this supposedly focal section of his narrative, placed nothing but a banded zone of vertical lines.

The bulk of the book seeks to explain what belts meant to those who wore them. In B.'s view, most Homeric warriors wear a belt (*zôstêr*) as part of their armour, but only a select few have belts 'as fancy or magical' (p. 80) as those of Agamemnon, Menelaos, and Nestor, which have supernatural protective properties and serve as 'a conspicuous sign of rank' (p. 74). Noting the awkward position in Homer of kings whose power rests on hereditary authority rather than on outstanding warriorhood, he suggests that the 'distinctive' belt of a king is meant to be 'an unimpeachable emblem of warriorhood whether or not he merited it' (p. 90). This is inevitably highly speculative, but it does seem an intriguing possibility.

B. weakens his case by pushing it too hard, claiming that, just because it does not include a belt, Achilles' armour—impenetrable, and made by a god—is 'devoid of apotropaic power or divine sanction' (p. 90), and that the belt worn by the slave Eumaeus is not just a bit of string to hitch up his tunic, but a token of 'the fact that he is actually heir to a kingdom' (p. 98). He also needlessly complicates matters by insisting that 'the belted hero was an entirely poetic fabrication' (pp. 178, 184): the symbolism of the warrior-belt was the invention of Ionian oral poets inspired by the splendid Phrygian belts they had seen (p. 51), and was so successful that mainland Greeks started having bronze belts made in the epic image, and later incorporated belt-style designs into the newly adopted bronze corslet (p. 56–7). It is hard to see how poets could have helped legitimate royal power by attributing to legendary kings a fictional piece of armour with a meaning they had just made up; B.'s theory can surely work only if the warrior-belt was an actual part of eighth-century Greek regalia.

Other kinds of belt have their own chapters, including the athlete's *zôma* (explained, not as a loincloth, but as 'the *zôstêr* stripped of its practical use for war and reduced to its symbolic essence', p. 106), the *mitra*, the female *zônê* (which is likened to the corset in that it 'projects both modesty and eroticism', p. 140 n. 78), and an array of straps and belts from myth.

The publication of artefacts as interesting as the Harvard belt and fibula is, of course, very welcome, and one can only admire the ingenuity with which B. extracts a grammar of Geometric iconography from a couple of bronzes and a dramatic interpretation of belt-symbolism from two dozen references in epic poetry. But there is such a thing as being too imaginative, and it is a shame that every so often *Belted Heroes* abandons reason and takes the plunge, down the rabbit-hole, into Wonderland.

University College London HANS VAN WEES

S. Blundell: *Women in Classical Athens*. Pp. vii + 106, 22 ills. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 1998. Paper, £8.95. ISBN: 1-85399-543-6.

Like other titles in the Bristol Classical Press's Classical World Series, this is likely to be much used by A-level and undergraduate students, and anyone else who wants a concise account of the topic. The book takes as its starting point the various female figures depicted on the Parthenon, and the paradox that in Classical Athens 'a female warrior towered above a city in which women played no part in either warfare or politics' (p. 1). After a brief sketch of Athenian history in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C., four chapters each deal with particular categories: unmarried women (pp. 10–28), married women (pp. 29–80), goddesses and characters from myth (pp. 81–93), others (pp. 94–9). There are the usual 'suggestions for further study' and an annotated reading list (pp. 102–4). The title suggests a more specific focus than B.'s earlier *Women in Ancient Greece* (see my review, *CR* 46 [1996], 378–9), but B. does occasionally stray from her brief by including non-Athenian material. Under 'unmarried women', for example, there is an excursus on the Aphrodite of Knidos (pp. 20–4)—fourth-century Knidos is not Athens (nor is Aphrodite in any sense 'unmarried'!). I can see why she is here, but a cautionary note might have been sounded for the uninitiated. Likewise the example of an infertility cure quoted (p. 44) concerns a woman from Epiros healed at Epidauros (*IG* IV^2 1.121–2b no. 31)—it needs to be made explicit that some Athenian women would have made the trip to Epidauros, while others might have sought help closer to home, at the Athenian Asklepieion or other healing shrines. At fifty-two pages (half the book), the chapter on 'married women' heavily outweighs that on 'other women'—metics, slaves, and prostitutes—who get a mere five pages. The imbalance is inevitable, but I would have preferred a division which emphasized the extent to which 'other women' shared the day-to-day experience of citizen wives. I would also have been inclined to put Chapter IV earlier, since most of the goddesses and mythological characters surveyed here appear in Chapters II–III in connection with mortal women, either as paradigms or in the context of ritual practice. But these are minor points, or matters of personal preference. Despite the introductory nature of the book, B. manages to get across a good deal of recent thinking on some contentious issues alongside the basic information (though I missed any hint of controversy over the Parthenon frieze, pp. 5–6). Throughout an attempt is made to relate potentially alien subject matter to modern experience (I had never thought of the Pygmalion story in terms of blow-up dolls before! p. 21), and the inclusion of so many individual, historical women—Axiothea, Phrasikleia, Xenokleia, Neaira, Aspasia, Xanthippe, Aristotle's daughter—gives the book an immediacy often lacking in such general accounts. Thorough referencing on every point would obviously not be appropriate, but B. draws upon a wide range of material—inscriptions and iconography as well as all sorts of genres of literature—and frequent quotation/illustration of this material provides an excellent introduction to the variety of evidence available. I would suggest that anyone seriously interested in the subject (e.g. taking a module on 'Women in the Classical World' or similar) should rather invest in B.'s earlier book, which in many ways gives you more for your money, but for those who want a 'quicker fix', this book is reliable and lively.

University of Wales, Lampeter EMMA J. STAFFORD

Deborah Gera: *Warrior Women. The Anonymous* Tractatus De Mulieribus. Pp. xi + 252. Leiden, New York, and Cologne: E. J. Brill, 1997. Cased, $94.50. ISBN: 90-04-10665-0.

Deborah Gera has brought to our attention a fascinating and neglected text consisting of brief notices of fourteen women who played important roles in their communities, often reigning as queen. They range from well-attested figures such as Semiramis and Artemisia to the otherwise unknown Onomaris of the Galatians. To a large extent, the volume constitutes part of an expanding body of scholarship on warrior women, following such studies as J. Blok, *The Early Amazons: Modern and Ancient Perspectives on a Persistent Myth* (Leiden, 1994). G.'s use of the title *Warrior Women* follows the Greek title given the text in the manuscripts (γυναῖκες ἐν πολεμικοῖς συνεταὶ καὶ ἀνδρεῖαι), but it is nonetheless misleading. The text is not wholly about warrior women, for over one-third are not presented as warriors. Argeia and Lyde in particular are not accorded masculine traits or attributes.

No text dealing with independent or powerful women is easy to engage with, but this one poses particular difficulties. Its date, purpose, and authorship may be unrecoverable, and its genre cannot be established with certainty. Intriguingly, 'we do not know if we are supposed to find these women paradoxical or praiseworthy, admirable or amazing' (p. 19). G. proposes one particularly useful means of making sense of them, namely, comparison with the Amazons, 'the very archetype of women warriors' (p. 17). Set against the Amazons, the women of *De Mulieribus* (*DM*, to use G.'s abbreviation) offer safe images of feminine power: Amazons oppose and threaten civilized society, but these women adhere to patriarchal norms and values, and tend to be defined in relation to male relatives ('sister of Pygmalion' [Theiosso-Dido], 'daughter of Lygdamis' [Artemisia], etc.). To go beyond G., however, it might be posited that the women are, in a sense, more troubling and problematic than the Amazons—the latter inhabit the periphery; these women bring feminine pugnacity to the heart of civilized (male) society, and overturn its norms. Artemisia's *ἀνδρεία*, to give the most striking example, leads the Persian king to envisage a topsy-turvy world in which 'his women had become men and his men women'.

A characteristic feature of *DM* is the citation of a source for almost every woman. Because of this, particular consideration of the text in reference to its sources is called for. G.'s discussion of the individual notices is largely devoted to these sources, but she focuses too much on the sources themselves rather than on ADM's (her abbreviation for the anonymous author) treatment of them. Striking omissions are discernible which could usefully have been considered. For example, G. tells us that Ctesias records that the first woman, Semiramis, adopted non-gender-specific clothing in order to join battle, but fails to mention ADM's omission of this detail. This is a pity, because such omissions point to the means whereby the material is organized and arranged in such a way as to avoid excessive repetition within the short text—Atossa, the seventh woman, is said to have adopted precisely this kind of clothing. Certainly, G. indicates her awareness of the author's selectivity, but deviations from the sources are presented as shortfalls or inaccuracies, or treated dismissively: G. states, 'ADM (on the whole) simply summarizes his sources selectively' (p. 19). But what is simple about this? Complex interactions between notices are discernible, and G.'s study might have benefited from greater discussion of the network of meanings produced in the text. For example, material concerning Tomyris and Pheretime is used to present varying images of vengeful femininity, with the vengefulness of Tomyris stressed and that of Pheretime played down. Of Tomyris, G. states, 'the noble, vigorous, and wise Massagetan queen has more depth than that' (p. 204). But in simplifying Tomyris, the work is made richer by contrasts and interrelations between the two women. Similarly, Nitocris the Babylonian is presented as highly cunning (diverting water, tricking Darius) whereas the cunning of Artemisia, crucial in Herodotos, is omitted from *DM*.

The book includes a very useful translation of *DM*. It is also well referenced, and contains a good bibliography and indices. This is a valuable study, which should provoke further questioning of this complex text.

University of Keele SUSAN DEACY

L. L. Lovén, A. Strömberg (edd.): *Aspects of Women in Antiquity. Proceedings of the First Nordic Symposium on Women's Lives in Antiquity, Göteborg, 12–15 June 1997*. Pp. 191, 5 ills, 25 pls. Jonsered: Paul Aströms Förlag, 1998. Cased. ISBN: 91-7081-188-1.

This is a short book which, to paraphrase the TV commercial, 'does exactly what it says on the cover'. It is a collection of short articles producing an overview of current research into the lives of women in antiquity as carried out by scholars from Scandinavia. Given that the chronological span and subjects of articles in this volume is so wide-ranging, I think this review can best serve it by listing them: A. Strömberg, 'Sex-indicating Grave Gifts in the Athenian Iron Age: an Investigation and its Results'; B.-M. Näsström, 'Cybele and Aphrodite: Two Aspects of the Great Goddess'; L. Viitaniemi, 'Parthenia—Remarks on Virginity and its Meanings in the Religious Context of Ancient Greece; S. des Bouvrie, 'Euripides, Bakkhai and Maenadism'; M. Nielsen, 'Etruscan Women: a Cross-cultural Perspective'; L. L. Lovén, '"Lanam fecit"—Woolworking and Female Virtue'; P. Setälä, 'Female Property and Power in Imperial Rome'; M.-L. Hänninen, 'Conflicting Descriptions of Women's Religious Activity in mid-Republican Rome: Augustan Narratives about the Arrival of Cybele and the Bacchanalia

Scandal'; J. Okland, '"In publicum procurrendi": Women in the Public Space of Roman Greece'; G. Vidén, 'The Two-fold View of Women—Gender Construction in Early Christianity'; U. Stahre, 'Penthesileia—a Deadly Different Amazon and Achilles' Lost Honour'; M. Skoie, 'Sublime Poetry or Feminine Fiddling? Gender and Reception: Sulpicia through the Eyes of Two 19th Century Scholars'.

Many of these articles are very condensed précis of theses, others present work in progress and as such will be useful to undergraduates and postgraduates beginning their research, both as points of reference and also to demonstrate the type of work that is current in other areas of European scholarship.

The condensed nature of the volume means that the articles are well focused and to the point, but at times this leads to a frustrating brevity and the appearance of generalization. Unfortunately that is the nature of the book. Despite this, there is much to stimulate discussion here and much to add to the body of knowledge we are acquiring on women in the ancient world. Literary analysis, and archaeological and art historical evidence are all represented here, and all articles are supported by comprehensive bibliographies which will give the student a good springboard for pursuing some of the ideas contained within. There is no overarching approach to the study of gender, though some authors do discuss the problems of methodology (Okland, Strömberg, Lovén). The two most comprehensive case-studies are those of Skoie on the reception of Sulpicia and Setälä on women and brick production in Rome. A useful book for those teaching gender in antiquity courses, but for library acquisition rather than personal collections.

University of Birmingham MARY HARLOW

M. Wyke (ed.): *Gender and the Body in the Ancient Mediterranean*. Pp. ix + 219, ills. Oxford: Blackwell, 1998. Paper, £12.99. ISBN: 0-631-20524-1.

This is an excellent addition to the study of gender in the ancient world. A very stimulating collection of articles and thematic reviews of publications from this decade. Chapters range from the culture of Mesopotamia, to Egypt, to Classical Greece and Rome, to Jewish and Christian readings of the body. One of the most striking points of this volume is the interaction and analysis of contemporary debates about the body and gender with the ancient material and the methodologies of the various authors. Much of the writing on gender in the past decade has taken a very simplistic binary opposition as an analytical tool; this is thoroughly questioned and deconstructed by several of these authors. The attention paid to the body as an arena for gender identity from various geographical and cultural areas and periods highlights the multiplicity of meanings that can be attributed to both the physical and metaphorical representations of the gendered body in antiquity.

Julia Asher Greve in 'The Essential Body: Mesopotamian Conceptions of Gender' examines literary and visual evidence from ancient Mesopotamia (*c.* 3000–1600 B.C.E.), and, by looking at the ambiguities of gender inherent in the representation of certain Mesopotamian deities and in Sumerian language, questions assumptions of binary opposition. Ann Kessler Guinan in 'Auguries of Hegemony: the Sex Omens of Mesopotamia' concentrates on a small group of omens that are explicitly sexual in content. These, in the typically ambiguous way of omens, contain fascinating warnings and social consequences of particular heterosexual and homosexual acts. Guinan asserts that these omens, interpreted in the context of divination, can offer interesting insights into how male erotic behaviour can be understood and how male members of society might control their sexual desire for their own social and economic benefit. Mary Beard and John Henderson take a highly sceptical view of the way the idea of sacred prostitution is used in the narratives of both ancient and nineteenth- and twentieth-century scholarship, they show how the female body and female sexuality have been both eroticized and vilified in association with the religious or semi-religious practices of the Near East. Extracts from modern scholarship illustrate the pervasiveness of the idea of temple harlots despite very little 'real' foundation. Robin Osborne looks to the nudity of the male body in Classical Greek art, and argues an evolving imagery that by the sixth century is displaying a discourse about the proper control of male sexuality. He argues that the desire to present the naked male Greek body as heroic or representative of athletic practice is naive and that vase paintings and the practice of representing male infibulation are sending complex ideas of male sexuality to the viewer. Julia Sebesta, on the other hand, examines the clothed body of the Roman woman. In this re-examination of the use

of the female body and correct female behaviour in the context of Augustan propaganda the focus is directly on clothing and its meaning with particular reference to the transition from youth to adulthood. The last three articles concern transformations of the physical body, either by removal of parts or diet, and the ramifications of this for differing constructions of gender in different cultural contexts. Lynn Roller is concerned with eunuch priests and the reaction of Greek and Roman society to these sexually ambiguous figures. Shaye Cohen asks 'Why Aren't Jewish Women Circumcised?'. Circumcision serves as a bodily marker and form of identity for Jewish men but there is not a comparable bodily identification for Jewish women. The implications of this for both Jewish and gender identity are considered in the context of early Christian and Jewish texts. It seems that Christians were far more interested in this phenomenon than the rabbis, for whom the 'natural' inferiority of women was self-evident and therefore a lack of bodily sign of Jewishness was unproblematic. Christian interest in the body, particularly the female body, is the subject of the final article by Teresa Shaw. Focusing on the work of Basil of Ancyra, 'On the True Purity of Virginity', Shaw illustrates the predication of ascetic Christianity on the female body. Regimes of fasting and other physical deprivations could transform the weak female body with a more masculine form but, unfortunately for women, femaleness is inescapable according to Basil, and female salvation will always be somehow lesser than that of males.

The last section of this book, the thematic reviews, is equally as useful as the longer articles. There is not room here to list all the texts reviewed, but the names of the reviewers should send readers to this section of the book: L. Meskell, A. Sharrock, J. Walters, P. Cartledge, H. King, and G. Clark. Finally there is a short useful section by John Younger on Internet sites that focus on gender and sexuality.

One of the most stimulating and accessible set of articles on gender that has been produced in the last few years.

University of Birmingham MARY HARLOW

J. S. Kloppenborg, S. G. Wilson (edd.): *Voluntary Associations in the Graeco-Roman World*. Pp. xviii + 333. London and New York: Routledge, 1996. Cased, £50. ISBN: 0-415-13593-1.

Based as it is on papers taken from a seminar organized by the Canadian Society of Biblical Studies ten years ago, this volume is narrower in subject matter than its title implies. The emphasis is almost wholly on Eastern 'religious' (broadly defined) and philosophical associations of the Hellenistic period. The overriding themes are of differentiation and integration: these are explored in a number of papers that examine how Jews and Christians negotiated their place in Graeco-Roman society. Their findings offer explanations as to why Jews (and later, Christians) sometimes avoided persecution. Mason, for example, argues that Jews appropriated 'philosophy' to win acceptability in wider society. Philosophical schools were generally held in high esteem in Graeco-Roman society and, since Judaeans had often been regarded as a nation of philosophers, they hid behind this categorization—with its aura of respectability—to defend themselves.

Christian *ekklesiai*, according to McCready, used similar techniques. They kept their distinct identity by virtue of, for example, their multi-dimensional social status and intimacy among members, and also by their rites and initiations. But, ironically, it was only by adopting the guise of other, accepted, Graeco-Roman associations that they could pursue their own distinctive activities relatively free from suspicion. Tellingly, *ekklesiai* ran into trouble when they tried to retain their separate identity while also attempting to engage with outsiders.

Constraints on such behaviour is the subject of Cotter's chapter, which reviews the relevant laws from the late Republic through to the early principate. Judaism alone escaped legal restrictions, she argues, because the Romans respected its antiquity, and because of its reputation for stability and loyalty. Cotter goes on to speculate that Christianity sometimes escaped 'informal scrutiny' by local officials by wearing Judaism's more acceptable cloak.

Richardson's chapter contains further overlap of argument and material, claiming as it does that, in the Diaspora, synagogues functioned and were perceived as *collegia*. Like McCready and Mason, he argues that the earliest synagogues appeared largely indistinguishable from other *collegia* structures. For this reason, outsiders were not sure what to call them, nor how to deal with them.

Judaism's resemblance to *collegia* is pursued by Walker-Ramisch in her study of the Damacus

document (CDC). While CDC suggests many congruences between the community to which it refers and Graeco-Roman *collegia*—such as in its mirroring of municipal organization—the community's differences are underlined in CDC's language of exclusivity, and particularly in its 'eschatological destruction of outsiders'. Thus the similarities speak of Jewish communities' need to negotiate 'temporary patterns of coexistence with the dominant power'; at the same time, the differences are revealing of Judaism's unique socio-historical experience.

Via an analysis of architectural forms, McLean divides voluntary associations on Delos into those with internal and those with external cult (in relation to place of assembly). This methodology leads him to observe that Delian Christians, probably influenced by other voluntary associations on the island, came to regard the Eucharist as a cultic meal, and—like other cultic organizations—incorporated 'cultic' space into their churches. Again, it seems, Christians were anxious to ensure that, for their own protection, their external appearance implied no 'radical disjunction' between themselves and other associations.

Less revelatory are three papers on women in voluntary associations. One, on the Dead Sea Scrolls community, is too preliminary to add much to our knowledge. But in the others, the contribution made to each association by its immediate context again seems crucial. Richardson and Heuchan suggest that the relative importance of women in two different Jewish communities in Egypt was due largely to the examples of influential women in Hellenistic Egyptian cults, by female monarchs, and, indeed, by women in Egyptian society more generally.

Matila's study of various synagogue seating arrangements militates against the assumption that the status or experience of Jewish women was uniform. Each variation reflected the diversity of each local context. In this respect, Judaism is shown once more to have been highly attuned to its particular setting and to local sensibilities.

The array of ancient terminology used by and for non-Jewish or Christian voluntary associations is explored thoroughly in Kloppenborg's study of *collegia* and *thiasoi*. His most important argument, however, is that these clubs cut across social distinctions, effectively mediating between formal and informal networks, and helping to bind a minority élite to the much larger, poorer urban mass. *Collegia*, in this view, were vital for maintaining social order.

The importance of informal networks is stressed by Remus in a novel but meticulous study of Aelius Aristides' contacts during his time at the Asclepieion at Pergamum. Counting sixteen categories of networks, ranging from family through Co-incubants–Acquaintances to Physicians–Friends, Remus shows how they intermeshed either with Aelius Aristides or with each other so as ultimately to assist Aristides' recovery. In reconstructing links between the different categories, Remus demonstrates how they should be seen as an association with voluntary ties, and not simply as an aggregation of individuals.

In sum, this volume should be of considerable interest to anyone researching religious associations, other Graeco-Roman associations, or marginal social groups. While most chapters focus on Jews and Christians, the book as a whole has much wider potential value. Taken together, the papers present compelling reasons to explore further the mechanics and dynamics of social boundaries, and in particular the junctures between formal and informal networks. To understand these is potentially to understand reasons for social cohesion, but also for the breakdown of social order in the ancient world.

Fitzwilliam College, Cambridge HELEN PARKINS

M. Moggi, G. Cordiano (edd.): *Schiavi e dipendenti nell'ambito dell''oikos' e della 'familia'. Atti del XXII Colloquio GIREA, Pontignano (Siena), 19–20 novembre 1995*. Pp. 463. Pisa: Edizioni ETS, 1997. ISBN: 88-467-0038-4.

The fruits of an Italian colloquium, thirteen of the published contributions are in Italian, four in French, three in Spanish, and one in English. Nine papers deal with Greek history, twelve with the Roman world. Although a modicum of superficial unity is imposed by the general theme of the collection, there is hardly any conversation between individual papers. At the same time, a different kind of homogeneity arises from the similarity of methodological approaches. Thus, the majority of papers—at least two-thirds even on a conservative count—revolve around individual texts or narrow questions of detail. As a consequence, inductivism is rife, conceptualization of broader historical themes and problems remains rare, and the volume falls into a

series of unrelated glimpses of the contributors' individual preoccupations and favourite samples of ancient sources.

The frustrating shortcomings of the evidence are thrown into sharp relief in a few papers that venture beyond the core areas of classical slavery. When Lombardo looks for slavery in Magna Graecia, the difficulties of identifying dependence in the material record force him to fall back on anecdotal traditions where available, in this case Sybaris and Tarentum. Yet even with the help of these bits of information, fourth-century B.C. changes in land-holding patterns can only tentatively be correlated with the development of rural slavery. Mele, exploring the underpinning of wool production in Tarentum, is reduced to relying on three epigrams in the *Anthologia Palatina* which seem to link this kind of work to free female labour in a modest domestic setting. Slaves are absent from the record (such as it is), but also from real life? With greater awareness of the limits of miserable sources, Storchi Marino offers a cautious discussion of the traditions of slavery and dependence in archaic Rome, perforce—and in this case consciously so—a weighing of historiographical 'models' both ancient and modern.

A few papers deserve closer attention. Garrido-Hory, once more building on her earlier work, offers a useful analysis of the representation of different kinds of slaves (*puer* vs. *minister*) in Martial and Juvenal, highlighting the rôle of slaves as markers of owners' status and conduct. Hodkinson and Paradiso partly cover the same ground in discussing dependence in Spartan *oikoi*, as opposed to collective rural helotage. Hodkinson, surveying a wide range of various categories of domestic dependants from helots to concubines, bastards, *mothakes*, and *trophimoi*, documents the Spartan custom of parading status by gathering followers of markedly different ranks. Bellocci, drawing on sparse legal references to suicide attempts by slaves, advances the optimistic thesis that by the time of Ulpian, the Roman slave, instead of being degraded to a mere *res*, had attained the standing of a real person. However, it might be more appropriate to consider seemingly conflicting evidence against the background of the perennial and irresoluble contradiction inherent in the twin nature of slaves as both chattels *and* human beings. Martini briefly discusses the status of *apeleutheroi*, former slaves traversing Finley's spectrum from unfree to free; Placido explores Greek terminology of slavery, fittingly with special reference to *oiketai.*

Ragone, in an elaborate survey of the different versions of the tale of Aesop the slave, lavishes extraordinary attention on philological and often incidental detail, thereby obscuring its considerable relevance to the subject of domestic slavery; the contrast with Keith Hopkins's imaginative exploitation of this material (*Past & Present* 138 [1993], 3–27, unknown to R.) could hardly be starker. When Gonzales devotes almost fifty pages to slaves and freedmen in Pliny's letters, he is clearly driven by the desire to achieve exhaustive coverage rather than by a sustained argument or question. As so often with this genus, a dishearteningly large number of contributions have little bearing on the overall theme or are of purely antiquarian interest. Bresson's study of the onomastics of Rhodian slaves rather unhelpfully documents lack of difference from other Greek communities; much to the same effect, Angeli Bertinelli takes us through an analogous list of slaves in Roman inscriptions from Luni. Schiavone, on conflicting traditions of ancient slavery as 'natural' institution or social convention, says nothing new or relevant to a domestic context. Mencacci talks about thirteen pairs of twin slaves in the city of Rome and Smadja about money and slaves in Plautus, while Mangas compiles a list of epigraphically attested sub-adult slaves in various locales only to arrive at the unsurprising result that very young slave children were rarely commemorated. Further examples could be added. Less would have been more.

Darwin College, Cambridge WALTER SCHEIDEL

R. Sablayrolles: *Libertinus Miles: les cohortes de vigiles*. (Collection de l'École française de Rome, 224.) Pp. ix + 875, 7 ills, 4 pls. Rome: École française de Rome, 1996. Paper. ISBN: 2-7283-0365-7.

Devastation by fire was a frequent occurrence in ancient cities, and the greater the city, the greater the threat. This is brought out in the useful final appendix to S.'s book, in which he presents a descriptive list of eighty-eight major conflagrations in the city of Rome. Eighty-four of them are recorded between 275 B.C. and A.D. 410, an average of one every eight years. To meet this threat, by the early imperial period Rome had the most developed and best organized fire brigade of the ancient world, the *Vigiles.* The study of such an institution requires the deployment and integration of literary, archaeological, and epigraphic evidence with a considerable level of technical skill in each area, together with the ability to apply comparative

and modern scientific evidence. S. manages this multi-disciplinary balancing act extremely well and has produced a veritable *tour de force.*

The first section of the book provides an overview of the history of fire-fighting in the city of Rome. Under the Republic, fires were at various times and in various circumstances the responsibility of the consuls and aediles, the *tresviri nocturni* and *capitales*, and the *quinqueviri uls cis Tiberim*, perhaps assisted by a few hundred slaves of the *familia publica*. It was Augustus who created a dedicated fire brigade for the capital. After a false start in 22 B.C., with 600 slaves being placed at the disposal of the curule aediles, he tied in the administration of fire-fighting with his reorganization of Rome into fourteen districts. In 7 B.C., responsibility was transferred to the newly created *vicorum magistri*, but when another series of fires in A.D. 6 proved this arrangement to be inadequate, he set up an entirely new paramilitary force, the seven cohorts of *Vigiles*, each with responsibility for two regions and manned by freedmen and under the command of a Roman knight. This should be understood in the context of other developments in the creation of the standing Roman army at this period, but S. rather overlooks these, partly because he sees the *Vigiles* as bestriding the civilian/military divide which Augustus' army reforms had confirmed.

The *Vigiles* can nevertheless be seen as a proper military force at least by the time of the suppression of Sejanus in A.D. 31, and the career structures of their centurions and tribunes soon became integrated into those of the urban garrison as a whole. By the third century, the majority of *Vigiles* may have been freeborn and many of them recruited from Africa and the Orient. They participated in the troubles in the capital (though not on the battlefield) in 69 and again in the second 'Year of Four Emperors' in 193, and were finally disbanded only in the late fourth century.

In the tradition of Roman Army studies, S. devotes several chapters to the officers and men. He notes that the Prefects had often either risen from the ranks of the Praetorians or had begun their careers as jurists. They frequently progressed to Praetorian Prefecture, though not to the Prefecture of Egypt, which was more often fed from the ranks *Praefecti Annonae.* These patterns suggest that relevant experience was at least a factor in the selection of senior officials, against the trend of recent scholarship, which has tended to emphasize the overriding importance of patronage. Tribunes and centurions were the *Vigiles*' link with the rest of the army and especially the urban garrison, since they were normally drawn from and rapidly promoted to other units. *Principales* usually came from internal promotion, and transfers to other units were rarer than in other branches of the service.

Terms of service for the ordinary soldier are obscure. Length of service is unknown, although S. suggests between twenty and twenty-six years on the basis of the few surviving epigraphic lists which can be compared. He also argues for a higher mortality rate early in service than for other units of the urban garrison, presumably because of the hazards of their job. Despite their military organization, the *Vigiles* appear to have received less respect and, to judge by their epitaphs, to have had more difficulty in finding marriage partners. The epigraphic evidence for these conclusions is, however, limited and difficult to interpret, as S. himself admits, and cannot be pressed too far.

The archaeological evidence for camps of the *Vigiles*, especially that at Ostia, receives detailed attention. S. argues that each cohort may have had distinct barracks (*castra*) and guard-posts (*excubitoria*), and that Augustus had made the size of each region covered relative to the danger of fire: densely populated regions were smaller than regions which included large gardens and open areas. Ostia and, apparently, Pozzuoli had their own barracks to house the vexillations outposted to them by rotation.

Fire-fighting was, self-evidently, an important part of their duties, as confirmed by the evidence for the equipment they deployed—buckets, pickaxes, hooks, and even water-pumps. S., however, rejects the suggestion that they made use of artillery pieces to demolish buildings for firebreaks on the grounds of impracticality. More controversially, he argues that the *Vigiles* were relatively ineffectual in putting out fires. Their pumps, for instance, were certainly incapable of projecting water under any significant pressure. He therefore concludes that their principal rôle was in fact fire prevention through their nightly patrols, which also watched for minor criminal activity.

The density of S.'s coverage of these topics has produced a long book, made even longer by his luxuriant French prose. In addition, more than one-third of the volume consists of appendices providing prosopographies of Prefects, sub-Prefects, tribunes, centurions, *principales*, *immunes*, and ordinary soldiers, with commentaries where appropriate, and bibliographical and epigraphic references. Although these act as a useful index to the *Vigiles*, they would have been much more valuable if texts and photographs of the inscriptions on which they are based had been provided. But that, of course, would have made the book even longer and perhaps necessitated a second volume. In truth, this is as meticulous and comprehensive a book as one could wish for, and a

splendid piece of detailed scholarship. It will remain the standard work on the subject for many years to come.

Royal Holloway, London BORIS RANKOV

CHARLOTTE SCHUBERT: *Land und Raum in der römischen Republik. Die Kunst des Teilens*. Pp. viii + 173, ills. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1996. DM 58. ISBN: 3-534-13189-4.

Schubert examines the relationship between land and space in the Roman Republic. When land was measured and allocated through the work of the land surveyors (*agrimensores*), living space was shaped and bounded. After a short chapter on the origin and nature of Roman land measurement, S. deals with the design and layout of Greek city-states, emphasizing the strong relationship between the land and the urban centre. There is a useful review of the evidence for land division in Greek colonies, though it must remain doubtful to what extent the layout of Greek settlements in Italy influenced the Romans. The context was entirely different, since the Romans exercised an extraordinary degree of central control over many disparate areas and locations.

In Chapter III S. describes how the development of centuriation in the Roman Republic was linked to the founding of colonies, and to decisions on what land to occupy and how to divide it equitably among the settlers. Of course, as the land surveyor Siculus Flaccus said, 'War was the motive for dividing up land', and the division of land symbolized continuing Roman warfare and the conquest and appropriation of territory, followed by new settlements and local administrative structures. From this widespread aggrandisement arose potential conflict, as there was a tendency for private individuals to try to usurp the ownership of land owned by the state.

Regulation of the use of public lands soon became embroiled in political struggles in Rome, and in particular the reforms of the Gracchi and the work of the Gracchan land commission are central to the understanding of the political and economic history of Italy in the middle Republic. Furthermore, fresh settlements of veterans added a new dynamic to political life (Chapters IV–V). For these themes see now D. Gargola, *Lands, Laws, and Gods* (Chapel Hill, 1995).

S. has produced a readable, brief introduction to an important area of Roman history. However, although she understands the importance of the *agrimensores*, she has not fully exploited this source, and aspects that seem highly relevant are treated briefly or neglected entirely. We hear little about sacred spaces, jurisdiction over distributed land, land in peripheral space, i.e. lands not included in distributions but often appropriated by private individuals (*subseciva*), and the nature of land disputes surely very important in the equitable management of space. Furthermore, what did land surveyors think was the best way to divide land and apportion living space?

In dealing with archaeological evidence for field systems in Italy, S. relies heavily on G. Chouquer (ed.) *Structures agraires en Italie centro-méridionale* (Rome, 1987), but without adequate discussion of the difficulty of interpreting the evidence, the dating of field systems, and the value of the *Liber Coloniarum* as an independent source. A particular problem is the significance of dividing land by strips (*scamnatio* and *strigatio*), since it is by no means clear that this was merely an early form of centuriation, and so its rôle in assisting the relative dating of settlements is uncertain.

The Queen's University of Belfast BRIAN CAMPBELL

P. JESKINS: *The Environment and the Classical World* (Classical World Series). Pp. viii + 91, 22 ills. London: Duckworth, 1998. Paper, £8.95. ISBN: 1-85399-547-9.

This slim volume belongs to the series published by Bristol Classical Press, designed to provide concise introductions to major topics for sixth-formers and undergraduates following courses in Classical Civilization. It includes suggestions for study and further reading, and all passages of ancient literature are presented in translation.

The scope of this volume is ambitious—its aim is to introduce to the uninitiated the 'effects of geography, climate and resources on the social and economic life of the classical world' (p. viii). Even though its actual geographical parameters are limited to the Mediterranean world (in particular fifth-century Athens and Roman Italy during the Republic and early Principate) rather than the Classical world in its widest sense, the challenges of writing such a book would make the most intrepid author blanch.

The chapter headings covered by the book are varied: 'Geography, Climate and Resources'; 'Political Life'; 'Community and Social Life'; 'Economic Life'; 'Travel and Communications; and finally, 'Warfare'.

The book is based on the premise that there is a fundamental difference between ancient and modern responses to the environment, and that the former was largely limited by primitive technological know-how for adapting to the natural environment (p. 1). By contrast, in modern times, the environment is reshaped to suit human demand. This essentially idealizing view of a more simple, and therefore morally better, world buys directly into the Golden Age ideologies promoted by the Greeks and Romans themselves. To a large extent, this interpretation is due to the author's extensive use of poetry in forming her picture of the ancient world. Only occasionally does she acknowledge that poetry does not necessarily reflect reality very closely. Instead, the famous verses of Horace addressed to the spring of Bandusia, along with Ovid's description of Narcissus' self-absorption in the pool, are used to illustrate the attractiveness of springs in Italy, without any sense of the irony of either poet (p. 6). Most worryingly, Virgil's *Georgics* is said to 'encapsulate 30 years' practical experience' (p. 44), and Horace's satire on his 'journey to Brundisium' becomes a travel journal (p. 67).

Given the book's preoccupation with the natural world, it is a shame that its main primary source-material is literary rather than archaeological. Archaeology is not entirely missing, but it is eclipsed. Striking opportunities are missed: one shipwreck receives only passing reference, without any consideration of the nature of its cargo or geographical location, and without suggesting what shipwrecks as a whole can add to our overall picture of trade and communications, beyond showing that 'all bulk products went by sea' (p. 63). Likewise, the problems of water supply are discussed without giving much of a sense of the outstanding achievements in water management by the Romans (aqueducts are represented as channels on arches, ignoring the fact that most aqueducts are underground pipelines, using sophisticated technology such as inverted siphons). The UNESCO Libyan Valleys survey revealed all too clearly how much modern North Africa could learn from the agricultural water systems of Roman times.

Sometimes, the book can be rather misleading. For example, the Roman Republic receives brief notice at the end of the chapter dealing with political life (p. 27). In assessing the impact of climate, the author fairly emphasizes the importance of outdoor assemblies. She rightly states that the *comitia* at Rome carried out the major business of state, but she questions whether there was ever 'any pretence of democracy'. Clearly, it is fair enough to draw contrasts between Athens and Rome, but she omits any reference to the most 'democratic' function of the popular assemblies—passing legislation.

The book is written in a lively style, and is generously illustrated with line drawings alongside photographs and maps. A few places mentioned in the text or illustrated in figures, however, fail to find their way onto the maps at the back of the book. In short, it provides an accessible introduction to the subject, but it is questionable to what extent it will help students gain a real insight into the topic.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford ALISON E. COOLEY

J. L. Davis (ed.): *Sandy Pylos: an Archaeological History from Nestor to Navarino*. Pp. xliii + 342, 115 photos, 16 drawings, 11 maps. Austin: The University of Texas Press, 1998. Paper, $24.95. ISBN: 0-292-71595-1.

This volume provides a first synthesis of a multidisciplinary regional studies project, the Pylos Regional Archaeological Project, which involved a diachronic archaeological survey of part of modern Messenia in southwestern Peloponnese. Fieldwork for the project was carried out by an international, mostly American, team between 1991 and 1995.

The introduction, written in a refreshingly personal tone, sets out the main aim of the book: to

write the first complete history of the region of Messenia. It is followed by an accessible and clear presentation of the environmental history of the region. A chapter on the history of archaeological research provides a useful, albeit rather descriptive and at times hagiographic, background to the project. The book is then arranged chronologically, starting with three chapters on the Mycenaean period followed by chapters on Classical, Hellenistic–Roman, Medieval, and Ottoman Messenia. Each is followed by specialized short discussions on specific aspects or case-studies that exemplify the kind of questions archaeologists and their colleagues from other disciplines are addressing, and illustrate the methods and techniques they are using. At times the structure is odd: it is not clear why pottery analysis should be presented in the chapter on the Classical period; it would be better to present the post-Mycenaean occupation of the palace under the Early Iron Age rather than under the palatial system, etc. But these are quibbles in an otherwise very well structured and presented book.

The book provides a fairly balanced, thorough, and systematic history of the Messenian region: the tendency to equate the survey area with the entire region is (on the whole) avoided, and an attempt is made to redress the research bias towards the Late Bronze Age. There are, however, some gaps: the early prehistory, i.e. the Neolithic and the Early and Middle Bronze Age, are referred to, but not covered systematically, while three large chapters are dedicated to the Mycenaean period. The recent history and the present-day situation of the region are not really discussed either.

The chapters on the Mycenaean period include a very useful description of the Palace of Nestor, a lucid reconstruction of its operations, and an excellent discussion about the territory of the Pylos kingdom. This section includes the presentation of a fascinating discovery, the artificial port of Pylos, which adds a new chapter to the engineering achievements of the Mycenaeans. The survey data shed new light on the hitherto obscure Classical period, when Messenia was under Spartan rule. The chapter on Messenia after its liberation from the Spartans successfully places the region within the rapidly changing world of the Hellenistic kingdoms and the encroaching Roman Empire. However, the chapters on the Medieval and Ottoman periods provide a rather conventional historical synthesis, where the patchy survey data (some fragments of *sgraffito* ware, the ruins of an Ottoman estate) remain unconnected to the general picture. Not all chapters, therefore, are equally successful in integrating historical and archaeological data, in detecting the underlying trends and in placing Messenia in its wider historical framework.

The last chapter throws into relief some of the (inevitable) weaknesses of a book which is addressed to specialists and students of archaeology, but also to 'informed travellers'. The attempt at synthesis and integration sits uneasily between sections presenting the basic techniques of field-walking and the use of computers in archaeological surveys, while its main conclusion, that the definition of Messenia and Messenian identity has shifted over the ages, does not really come as a surprise to the scholarly community. The existence of different versions of the Messenian past is acknowledged, but the modern-day perceptions of the past by the Messenians themselves are left rather vague. This project (unlike earlier survey projects in Greece) seems to have made a genuine attempt to approach the local community and to use local knowledge. Nevertheless, local writings on Messenian antiquities are used only in order to extract information and are not seen as a different discourse on the past, one which operates on the basis of a romantic identification with the past and is very different from, indeed directly opposed to, the authors' emphasis on multivocality.

To conclude, the attempt to provide a synthesis before the final publication is laudable. All practitioners of archaeological survey should be encouraged to produce such a volume once work in the field is completed. But the question remains: can field survey, a technique which was after all conceived within a clearly processual and positivist frame of mind, be used for writing multivocal history?

Faculty of Classics, University of Cambridge SOFIA VOUTSAKI

W. G. Cavanagh, S. E. C. Walker (edd.): *Sparta in Laconia* (Proceedings of the 19th British Museum Classical Colloquium). Pp. 170, ills. London: British School at Athens, 1998. Cased, £26.50. ISBN: 0-904887-31-6.

This volume publishes the proceedings of a conference in 1995 which celebrated nine decades of

activity in Laconia on the part of the British School at Athens. The evidence for the material culture of classical Sparta and the question of its alleged austerity links five papers: R. Förtsch, 'Spartan Art: Its Many Deaths'; S. Hodkinson, 'Patterns of Bronze Dedications at Spartan Sanctuaries, *c*. 650–350 B.C.: Towards a Quantified Database of Material and Religious Investment'; C. M. Stibbe, 'Exceptional Shapes and Decorations in Laconian Pottery'; T. T. Smith, 'Drinks, Dances, and Dedications: the Archaic *komos* in Laconia'; M. Pipili, 'Archaic Laconian Vase-painting: some Iconographic Considerations'. Roman Sparta, the object of recent British work in the region, and field surveys provide two other connections: G. B. Waywell, J. J. Wilkes, and S. E. C. Walker, 'The Ancient Theatre at Sparta'; A. Panayotopoulou, 'Roman Mosaics from Sparta'; A. V. Karapanayiotou-Oikonomopoulou, 'A Roman Portrait of the Early Second Century A.D. from Monemvasia'; S. Raftopoulou, 'New Finds from Sparta'; C. B. Mee and W. G. Cavanagh, 'Diversity in a Greek Landscape: the Laconia Survey and Rural Sites Project'; K. Wilkinson, 'Geoarchaeological Studies of the Spartan Acropolis and Evrotas Valley: some Preliminary Conclusions'. Sparta early and late, and the history of British endeavour round out the collection: H. W. Catling, 'The Work of the British School at Athens at Sparta and in Laconia'; T. G. Spyropoulos, 'Pellana: the Administrative Centre of Prehistoric Laconia'; P. Cartledge, 'City and *chora* in Sparta: Archaic to Hellenistic'; D. Nicol, 'Byzantine Mistra—Sparta in the Mind'. The volume well illustrates the perennial fascination of Sparta and marks the substantial contribution of the British School to elucidating its problems: long may this continue.

University of Warwick MICHAEL WHITBY

S. LATTIMORE: *Isthmia (excavations by the University of California at Los Angeles and the Ohio State University under the auspices of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens) Volume VI: Sculpture II: Marble Sculpture, 1967–1980*. Pp. xviii + 64, 2 plans, 36 pls. Princeton: The American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1996. Cased, $55. ISBN: 0-87661-936-7.

This beautifully produced volume is well up to the usual high standards of the American School's *Isthmia* series, which publishes the results of their excavations at the Isthmian sanctuary of Poseidon. A brief introduction (pp. 1–4) places the items of marble sculpture in the context of the campaigns, between 1967 and 1980, in which they were found.

The catalogue (107 entries) then treats the sculpture under six headings: human heads and fragments of heads, anatomical fragments, fragments of draped figures, fragments of animal figures, reliefs, miscellaneous. The work concludes with a consideration of the general character of the sculpture and its significance (pp. 55–7). The thirty-six plates provide clear photographs of every last fragment catalogued, two plans give some idea of the find context, and there is a thorough index. Unlike the sculpture catalogued in *Isthmia* IV (1987, from campaigns 1952–67), which ranges in date from the seventh century B.C. to the third A.D., all but a few of the pieces in this volume are associated with the mid-second century A.D., and L. comments on 'the somewhat Eastern flavor' of the collection as a whole (p. 56). More than two-thirds of the collection come from the Antonine Bath, where a striking feature is the large number of fragments on a colossal scale, belonging to at least two figures possibly to be identified as Athena and Apollo (pp. 56–7). Apart from the fragments, two pieces stand out: a fine portrait head of Polydeukion, foster-son of Herodes Atticus (no. 1), and a relief stele, with portrait, recording the many musical victories of the aulos-player L. Kornelios Korinthos (no. 7). Several small heads are of some iconographic interest—a bearded god (no. 4), a sleeping Eros (no. 5), a winged Hermes (no. 6)—as are three votive reliefs, representing twin Cybeles (no. 9), three Nymphs (?no. 91), Hygieia, Telesphoros, and Asklepios (no. 90).

University of Wales, Lampeter EMMA J. STAFFORD

F. G. Lo Porto: *I villaggi preistorici di Murgia Timone e Murgecchia nel Materano.* (Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei: Monumenti Antichi, Serie Monografica 5.). Pp. 229, maps, ills. Rome: Giorgio Bretschneider, 1998, Cased. ISBN: 88-7689-130-7.

This is a book of two halves, each a discrete report. Yet there is much that unites the sites. Both were large ditched villages in the Neolithic and share similar material culture, architecture, and farming practices. They were first explored in the early part of this century and re-investigated in 1967. Commendably, evidence from both sets of excavations is presented here.

Some chronological issues warrant attention. At both sites the main prehistoric occupation is ascribed to the Middle Neolithic, on the basis of the ceramics. However, as Whitehouse ('The Neolithic Pottery Sequence in Southern Italy', *PPS* 35 [1969], 267–310) has observed, Neolithic pottery types overlap considerably. Potentially this calls into question much of the relative chronology (cf. the 'chronological problem' created by the quantity of Middle Neolithic types associated with Murgecchia Hut 16).

An uncalibrated radiocarbon chronology is used for the Neolithic, while traditional dating serves the Bronze Age. Only calibration offers accuracy, pushing the chronology back. In the Bronze Age the difference is only a century or two; by the Middle Neolithic it is a millennium.

The Murgia Timone report concentrates solely on the Neolithic, although later material is known from the site. By contrast, that on Murgecchia deals also with the Bronze and Early Iron Ages.

Iron Age Murgecchia is probably of most interest to the present readership. Greek material is entirely absent, although indirect Greek influence can be detected in the local geometric pottery. The decision to follow Yntema's typology with its unified system of nomenclature, for this material is to be welcomed. Regrettably L.P. seems unable to dispense entirely with the previous terminology.

Tombs provide insights into social behaviour. Thus, Tumulus 18 is considered to belong to a mother and child. The adult's grave-goods included bronze jewellery and a shell necklace. The child was accompanied by an amber necklace. Clearly prestige goods could be deposited with women and children. Further interpretation is possible, though none is offered. We may suggest that the child's status is by virtue of its familial relationships. The amber probably derives from Baltic sources and may have reached Italy via the Adriatic. The Ofanto Subgeometric I jug (no. 728) from the site furnishes evidence of contact with those involved in transadriatic trade.

Valuable new evidence on Materano prehistory is published here. The treatment of the finds is of the highest standard. The account, and especially the illustration, of the excavations is less satisfactory. The volume is mainly descriptive and such discussion of the two sites as there is could have been better integrated. That said, as a catalogue of material it is difficult to fault.

Accordia Research Institute, London EDWARD HERRING

M. Bentz: *Panathenäische Preisamphoren. Eine athenische Vasengattung und ihre Funktion vom 6.-4. Jahrhundert v. Chr*. Pp. 240, 136 pages of ills. Basel: Vereinigung der Freunde antiker Kunst, 1998. Cased. ISBN: 3-909064-18-3.

Panathenaic amphorae are an extreme case of the specialized custom-made pot-shape: they were made for a specific purpose, at particular times, and to a standard formula which changed very slowly. For reasons of religious conservatism they retained their original black-figure technique long after it was obsolete for other shapes and its conventions largely forgotten. The earliest date from around 560 B.C., and what is probably the last dismal ghost of the class, which Bentz does not pursue beyond the late fourth century B.C., appears in the early fourth century A.D. (Agora P26.600; J. Frel, *Panathenaic Prize Amphoras* [Athens, 1973], Fig. 33). During this long period of production the shape gradually loses contact with the transport amphora with which its early examples had strong affinities, though the vase remains top heavy and tends to a point at the base. The subject matter conforms to the early-established convention that Athena appears in a panel on the shoulder on one side, and the event for which the prize was won is illustrated in a matching panel on the other, though the details change: the Athena, originally

facing left, turns to face right sometime between 359 and 348 B.C. On all but the very earliest she stands between columns crowned by cockerels, with the inscription announcing that the vase is one of the prizes from Athens beside the left one. In the early fourth century B.C. an inscription naming the archon for the year appears beside the right-hand column, and the cocks are replaced by other symbols, often a representation of a statuary group; the Tyrannicides, and Kephisodotus' Eirene, and Ploutos are identifiable examples. Athena's dress follows fashion: the Hobble Group's conventional name needs no explanation.

Standard examples hold 35–39 litres of olive oil, produced from designated trees. A winner in the more prestigious contests in the Panathenaic Games might be awarded around 140 amphorae, so that any one year of the Games might result in commissions for over 1000 Panathenaics—the runners up were awarded them too. Some well-known practitioners and workshops evidently attracted commissions for them; quite a number of the big names appear among the attributions, and some makers signed their work. B. catalogues 421, a small fraction of what there must have been: we know that the auction of Alkibiades' property after he was exiled included some 100 Panathenaics: he won the chariot race in 418. Since they and their contents could be sold on, their findspots have a wide distribution, and they have been found in sanctuaries at Eleusis, Isthmia, Athena Chalkoikos in Sparta, Samos, Ephesos, and as grave dedications at home in the Kerameikos, but also in Etruria, Egypt, and the Crimea, and as part of what seems to be the rubbish of a *syssition* in the Athenian agora (S. Rotroff, J. Oakley, 'Debris from a Public Dining Place in the Athenian Agora', *Hesperia* Supplement xxv [1992]). At least one winner was buried, at Tarentum, with an amphora at each corner of his grave. They evidently were valued articles, and are represented in other media; there are also imitations of non-standard size or with variant decoration which were apparently souvenirs or perhaps prizes for non-Panathenaic contests (M. F. Vos, 'Some Notes on Panathenaic Amphorae', *OudhMeded* 62 [1981], 33–46).

B.'s monograph, a version of his 1997 thesis, is a thorough, up-to-date study of the archaic and classical Panathenaic, its iconography, producers, and findspots, and of the administrative structures which went with the Games and the award of prizes. Its illustrations are of a very high quality; they provide a vivid conspectus of the history of the vase-type in themselves, and add to the attractions of a very useful reference book which deserves to remain a standard source of information on this distinctive and important vase-type.

University of Glasgow ELIZABETH MOIGNARD

N. KUNISCH: *Ornamente Geometrischer Vasen*. Pp. xiv + 263, 96 ills. Cologne, Weimar, and Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 1998. Cased, DM 58. ISBN: 2-412-11897-4.

If you have ever wanted to find examples of 'fish, solid or hatched, as filling ornament', a 'hexafoil rosette with midribs', or a 'circle enclosing a hatched cross, with triangles in the spandrels and floor ornament', this would be an extremely useful addition to your library. Born, apparently, out of K.'s own frustration at the lack of such a thing, the book is a compendium of the most important decorative motifs found in Protogeometric and Geometric vase-painting. The material is arranged according to major pattern components: strokes and lines, rectangular motifs, lozenges, triangular, circular, and figurative motifs. Within these divisions, ninety-six entries deal with specific pattern types, each subdivided to give details of variations on the basic type and illustrated by a set of drawings. Thus, for example, under 'rectangular motifs' come eleven types of meander, with three to eleven variants on each type, ranging from the simplest single-line meander to double-, triple-, and even quadruple-meanders with hatching, cross-hatching, dots, or a patterned background, and turning to the left or the right—to mention just some of the possibilities. Under each significant variant references are given to where examples may be found (helpfully citing plate/figure numbers), drawing on a bibliography of about fifty items; for the most commonly found types a geographic/chronological range of examples is cited. The clear drawings and a thorough index of motifs make the book user-friendly, as does its most striking feature: the entries are in no fewer than five languages (German, English, French, Italian, modern Greek). For anyone interested in Geometric patterns, from an art-historical or purely aesthetic point of view, this volume provides an excellent overview, as well as being a handy reference tool.

University of Wales, Lampeter EMMA J. STAFFORD

A. MAGGIANI: *Vasi attici figurati con dediche a divinità etrusche*. Pp. 104, 122 ills. Rome: Giorgio Bretschneider, 1997. Paper. ISBN: 88-7689-069-6.

It is a truism that a large proportion of the surviving corpus of Attic vases was found in Etruria. Many owe survival to their burial in Etruscan tombs. Evidence of specialization in the needs of the export market materializes during the sixth century B.C. in the shape, literally, of groups of pots painted with Athenian pictures, but fashioned to imitate Etruscan models. The trademarks which often appear on the undersides of vessels exported to Etruria have been researched for clues about the costing and nature of batches of export pottery, and for information on trading patterns.

Other types of graffiti on exported Attic vases are less well-understood, in particular those explored here by Maggiani, which dedicate the vessel to an Etruscan deity. The pictures on Attic vases usually bear some relationship, more obvious in some cases than others, to the purposes for which the vessel was intended, at least on home ground, and occasionally the more obscure mythological scenes can convincingly be traced to a cult, and changing tastes in subject matter can be traced to changes of use or market. Some chosen subject matter can be shown to have appealed to Etruscan taste: Herakles, some of the bloodthirstier parts of the Trojan cycle, the iconography of wine at its more fantastic end. Visiting Greek deities are harder to explain, particularly when the vessel has a dedication to an Etruscan one. Was the deity illustrated assimilated to the one at the focus of the cult or sanctuary, or regarded as a suitable parallel? M. approaches this via Greek paradigms such as the identification of Aphaia on Aegina with Artemis, whose image appears on dedications made there, as does that of Apollo by a kind of associative elision.

M. catalogues the Attic vases with inscriptions to Etruscan deities, and is able to argue that at least some dedications in Etruscan sanctuaries show significant connections between the scenes which appear on the vessels and important aspects of the cult, if not a direct connection with the deity: battle scenes or their peace-time converse, athletics, are prominent, for example, at the sanctuary of Menerva, the warrior goddess, at Portonaccio. Herakles and the Dioskouroi can appear where the cult has to do with aspects of the afterlife even though not engaged in the sections of their life cycles which make a direct connection. Interpretation of the iconography in the light of the graffiti of these dedications is not straightforward: M.'s bibliography is a guide to the intellectual history of the problem; his list of dedications annotated with their subject matter by sanctuary demonstrates its size and difficulty.

A second strand deals with bronzes dedicated in sanctuaries, followed by a typology of types of offering. Two extended appendices discuss particular instances—a krater with a symposiast Herakles bearing an inscription to Fufluns, which may or may not be dedicating the krater to the god, and a bronze ram apparently dedicated to Poseidon, not usually a recipient of ovine offerings. The book focuses its material towards a better grasp of Etruscan practice, and perhaps taste, where unitary explanation is unlikely and even undesirable.

University of Glasgow ELIZABETH MOIGNARD

A. TEMPESTA: *Le raffigurazioni mitologiche sulla ceramica greco-orientale arcaica*. Pp. 200, ills. Rome: Giorgio Bretschneider, 1998. Paper. ISBN: 88-7689-152-8.

East Greek vases have been receiving more concentrated attention in the last decade; R. M. Cook and John Boardman have both pronounced recently; A. Lemos explored Chiot styles in 1991. This *RdA* supplement is a version of Alessandra Tempesta's Wurzburg thesis on the mythological scenes on archaic East Greek vases and sarcophagi; one of its benefits is some excellent plates illustrating some of the less well known members of figurative vase families such as the Northampton Group, and the Campana dinoi.

The diversity of local styles sheltering under the East Greek umbrella presents the major methodological difficulty—is there a common iconographic stock, or are East Greek tastes as diverse as the centres of production? How do the north Ionian styles relate to those of the south, if at all?

Erika Simon's introduction emphasizes East Greek culture as the birthplace of epic and cult

hymns. The earlier chapters of T.'s text are framed as a number of sections which use the subject matter of the vases as the starting point, with a literary base where it exists, rather than typologies based on the localized fabrics on which they appear. The Trojan cycle is followed by sections on other heroes, especially Herakles, and on the gods, including numerous Dionysiac scenes. There is a short section on myths specific to the geographical area—Arimasps and Griffins, and the Pygmies and Cranes. What emerges is a more coherent group of subjects than we might expect, with a different emphasis from the iconographic preoccupations of the Greek mainland.

The identification of iconographic interests then allows T. to produce a stylistic synthesis of her material which builds on and updates earlier treatments of her major groups and workshops; the Campana dinoi, the Northampton Group, and the Chanenko Group emerge as the products of a largely homogeneous context of production, if not from a single site; they link closely with Clazomenian vessels and sarcophagi, and show affinities with Athenian black figure. Chios emerges from T.'s analysis at the cutting edge of East Greek style, mainly via another look at its highly idiosyncratic chalices, which display epic themes given monumental treatment; Samos has a network of connections with north Iand Chios; situlae arc iconographic and stylistic sponges, absorbing influence from Corinthian, Attic, and neighbouring fabrics. Some material still defies attribution to a place of origin; Thasos needs more research on material of certainly Thasian origin—its Herakles cult seems to have resulted in massive imports of other fabrics with Herakles-related themes.

T.'s final analysis points towards a loosely homogeneous situation in which themes related to epic, and particularly the Trojan cycle dominate; Dionysiac material is the major important alternative. Athens was not necessarily the major extraneous source of influence on patterns of subject matter: Corinth provided a rather different set of models, particularly for the Fikellura style. Much of it translated back to Etruria, but that is another story, and Caeretan hydriae remain firmly in the background.

University of Glasgow ELIZABETH MOIGNARD

C. Zaccagnino: *Il thymiaterion nel mondo greco. Analisi delle fonti, tipologia, impieghi*. Pp. 224, 12 ills. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 1998. Cased. ISBN: 88-8265-009-X.

The title of the book promises an analysis of the primary evidence for the study of thymiateria (freely translated as 'incense burners') in the ancient Greek world, and to discuss their classification in typological groups as well as their function. After a one-page introduction (pp. 29–30), touching upon some basic scholarly trends about the form and definition of a thymiaterion, the body of Z.'s study is divided into two parts. The first part includes discussion of the substances used as incense with regard to their provenance and their diffusion in the Greek world through trade (pp. 33–100). This is followed by a presentation of sources, types, and uses of the vessels defined as thymiateria. The second part lists primary material, ranging from literary texts and inscriptions to artefacts bearing representations of thymiateria and also includes a list of published thymiateria from the Greek world (pp. 105–207).

While Z. demonstrated the rich documentation available for the study of an important category of objects mainly destined to serve ritual needs in sanctuaries (p. 51), her discussion of the possible functions of these objects is limited (pp. 51–65). The latter lacks a firm chronological and geographical framework within which to clearly indicate development of the function of thymiateria over time and in different geographical areas. Tragic drama and comedy do not appear to have been considered as possible sources for rituals in which thymiateria may have been used.

Precise information about archaeological contexts of thymiateria from Greek sanctuaries, including other types of objects possibly associated with them, is missing from the discussion of archaeological material (pp. 97–9). The latter includes a brief listing of the places from where published thymiateria are known (pp. 97–9) and a very brief survey of some archaeological contexts of thymiateria of various dates (pp. 98–9). Important details, such as state of preservation and find-locations of thymiateria, may be found in the list of them in the catalogue (pp. 173–207), but have not been included in the discussion. This would have enabled the reader to form a more precise idea as to the ways or stages of particular rituals in which they were used. The iconographical material is treated separately from the other types of evidence (literature, inscriptions, and archaeology), which sets inevitable limits to the discussion.

The emphasis of Z.'s study clearly lies in the precise definition and typological classification of the material rather than its detailed interpretation as a significant component of Greek cult practice. The amount of illustrations (eight plates and three drawings) poorly represents the wealth of material recorded in the catalogues (557 examples of representations of thymiateria and 293 thymiateria). Typos occur in many Greek bibliographical entries on pp. 15 (l. 37), 17 (ll. 21 and 22), 20 (l. 29), 23 (l. 35), and 24 (l. 26).

Overall, Z. has produced a useful study which collects and updates much of the published material available for the study of thymiateria in the ancient Greek world. It identifies an important aspect of ancient Greek cult and opens up further possibilities for future research.

Royal Holloway, London EVA PARISINOU

M. A. Eaverly: *Archaic Greek Equestrian Sculpture*. Pp. xiii + 141, 22 pls. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1996. $39.50. ISBN: 0-472-10351-2.

If you have never given much thought to archaic Greek equestrian sculpture as a class, here is your chance to find out all there is to know. Why should you be interested? Equestrian sculpture, it is suggested, can be a focus for the more general iconographical questions presented by archaic free-standing sculpture: whom do the figures represent, gods, heroes, or mortals, and what purpose did they serve? The second half of the book (pp. 71–126) is devoted to a comprehensive catalogue of extant free-standing full-size equestrian statues, all more or less fragmentary; eighteen entries each provide a detailed description, followed by discussions of style, date, and identifications posited by previous scholars. The first half of the book seeks to place the statues in their historical and cultural context, making use of literary sources and the comparative evidence of architectural sculpture and vase painting. Chapter II deals with geographical and chronological distribution, presenting us from the outset with the striking fact that, although small-scale equine and equestrian figures in bronze and terracotta are widespread throughout the Greek world from the Geometric period on, full-scale equestrian statues appear to be limited to Attika and 'Attic-controlled' Delos in the second half of the sixth century B.C., a distribution which immediately suggests Peisistratid influence. Chapter III addresses the question of the origins of the statues' style and iconography, comparing the figures with those seen in other media, with especial attention to the 'salient features of any equine depiction' (p. 23): pose of the rider, costume, and hairstyle; pose of the horse, trappings, and style of mane. After these technical considerations, Chapter IV brings us to the interesting question of the statues' meaning and identity. The rôle of the horse in late sixth-century Attic society is outlined, and possible occasions for the dedication of an equestrian statue considered, as well as potential divine and heroic candidates for representation in this form.

The project itself is a reasonable one, if a little narrow in focus, but the book suffers from two fundamental shortcomings. A basic methodological problem is entirely glossed over: precisely half of E.'s eighteen equestrian statues come from the Athenian Akropolis, one from the Kerameikos, one from Vari's cemetery, one from Eleusis, and six from Delos, yet the whole of E.'s hypothesis about 'meaning and identity' is based on the Akropolis riders, conceding almost as an afterthought that 'the two funerary statues may be representations of the deceased' (p. 67). Since even with the more thoroughly discussed kouroi/korai of the period the only relatively certain indication of purpose is provided by an inscribed base, one might have expected more to be made of the fact that Kerameikos P6999 (Cat. no. 5), quite apart from its provenance, has been 'plausibly' (p. 93) associated with a funerary inscription. The question of the context of the six examples from Delos is scarcely addressed; indeed, E. seems to take it for granted that Delos in the second half of the sixth century was more or less equivalent to the Athenian Akropolis as a display-context for free-standing sculpture. In many places the argumentation could be made more compelling by clearer presentation of the evidence available, and here the second shortcoming (perhaps a publisher's restriction?) makes itself felt: despite much trumpeting (on the dust jacket) of the 'rich comparative material' which will be brought to bear on the problems of interpretation, not a single example of such material is illustrated. The stylistic comparisons of Chapter III are extremely difficult to follow without illustrations (try e.g. the discussion of manes, pp. 37–41), and the more general iconographic arguments of Chapter IV might have carried more weight with the backing of an illustration or two, e.g. of the archaic red-figure *dokimasia* representations (p. 49), which seem particularly useful in pointing to a possible occasion for the

dedication of an equestrian statue (p. 70). The twenty-two plates at the end of the text are all of the sculptures themselves, all but two (of the Kerameikos rider, supplied by the DAI) being the author's own photographs, which it must be said are not of the highest quality; even these are awkward to use, since catalogue rather than plate numbers are referred to throughout the text, and the plate captions do not include cross-references to the catalogue.

In short, the catalogue serves a presumably useful purpose in giving a comprehensive treatment of a clearly definable group of statues, but the book as a whole adds little to the wider debate on the rôle of free-standing sculpture in the archaic period.

University of Wales, Lampeter EMMA J. STAFFORD

A. FILGES: *Standbilder jugendlicher Göttinnen. Klassische und frühhellenistische Gewandstatuen mit Brustwulst und ihre kaiserzeitliche Rezeption*. Pp. xv + 315, 222 pls. Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 1997. Cased, DM 148. ISBN: 3-412-01497-4.

In a classic example of the application of a venerable methodology and, at the same time, a testimony to the continuing viability of the various genres of stylistic analysis, Axel Filges presents an exhaustive treatment of draped female statues that display a distinctive drapery arrangement conventionally referred to as a 'Brustwulst'. Virtually untranslatable, 'Brustwulst' is a formal archaeological term used to refer to a characteristic feature of a woman's mantel worn in such a way that the rolled upper border is wrapped around her upper body, forming a diagonal bundle of thick folds across her chest. The present study represents a shortened version of the author's 1995 dissertation for the Westfalian Wilhelms-Universität, Münster.

Chapter I begins with a brief history of the scholarship on the 'Brustwulst' type and an introduction to the problems associated with its transmission from late Classical/early Hellenistic into a Roman idiom. In the discussion of the systems of terminology which have been applied to the study of Roman adaptations of Greek statuary types which follows, F. argues for more precision in the uses of terms that are already firmly established in the discourse (following, for the most part, the usages formulated by scholars like G. Lippold and P. Zanker), and he proposes refinements in the form of hyphenated terms that reflect additional subtleties in the wide range of relationships that can exist between an image and its model. An overview of the methodological bases for isolating, identifying, and dating the individual statuary subtypes that fall within the 'Brustwulst' category concludes the chapter.

The bulk of the monograph is devoted to Chapter II, the descriptive catalog with commentary. Monumental statues, statuettes, and relief figures are all included. F. has ordered the material into fifteen distinct subtypes, fourteen of which can be associated with Greek models. These range from the well known to several which had been heretofore only incompletely treated or are newly isolated by F. as distinct types. Within the section devoted to each individual group, F. lists and describes each image, referring to the black and white plates which illustrate all the sculptures and may be consulted readily at the back of the book. Depending upon the problems associated with each group, questions posed by the material are addressed at some depth, such as the recreation of the original upon which the copies are based, the identification, the evidence for dating, and finally, where appropriate, 'Meisterfrage'.

Chapters III, IV, and V are synthetic, addressing the following issues, among others: the 'Brustwulst' in Classical and early Hellenistic art and its association with Kore/Persephone; the stylistic development of the type; the translation of the originally Greek costume into Roman Imperial dress; the Roman reception of the Greek original and its adaptation to the formal vocabulary of portraiture; the context, placement, and function of portrait statues that feature the 'Brustwulst'; and the chronological and regional distribution of both the ideal and the portrait-bearing examples. Chapter VI consists of part one, which arranges the pieces in the catalog chronologically, using comparanda for which sources of illustrations and bibliography are cited in the notes, and part two, a compilation of the placement locations of documented Roman female portrait statues. Chapter VII is the catalog proper; Chapter VIII contains the sources of illustrations; and Chapter IX is a register of the current locations of the pieces in the catalog *and* the comparanda, as well as a list of all of the Classical and early Hellenistic statuary types referred to in the text and footnotes. The black and white illustrations follow, several per page, but perfectly legible.

It almost does not need to be said that F.'s work will serve as the standard reference for anyone interested in the 'Brustwulst' type, or that his careful, consistent application of appropriately descriptive art-critical terms is an admirable accomplishment in itself. But there is much more that should be of use to anyone interested in Roman copies, imitations, variants, and newly created versions of Greek statues. This is not just a catalog, but an analytical study that cuts the material in at least a dozen different ways, suggesting multiple directions for future scholarship. In many ways F.'s approach represents the opposite of *Kopienkritik*, in that he works conceptually forward from the originals rather than backwards from the copies, thereby granting a subtle edge in prestige to the productions of the copyists. With its quietly *andersdenkende* tone, this significant contribution to the study of Roman adaptations of Greek statuary types, as the author implies in his introduction, suggests ways to bridge the gap between Greek and Roman art historiographies.

The Cooper Union for the Advancement of Science and Art MARY STIEBER

K. SCHEFOLD: *Die Bildnisse der antiken Dichter, Redner und Denker*. Pp. 599, 331 ills. Basel: Schwabe, 1997. Cased, DM 150. ISBN: 3-7965-0997-3.

Few scholars can have had the fortune of being able to revise and update one of their own books more than fifty years after its original publication. None can have made such a radical transformation as Schefold has achieved with his seminal work on portraits of Greek and Roman poets, writers, and thinkers, first published in 1943. This new edition is over twice as long, and nearly three times as heavy, as its predecessor; and the extent of the rewriting is so great as to produce what is, in all essential respects, a new book. The new material reflects the pace of discovery and research during the post-war years (among the more important acquisitions one can mention inscribed busts at Aphrodisias which have enabled the identification of likenesses of Pythagoras and Pindar and an inscribed bronze in Malibu that has confirmed Studniczka's identification of Menander). All the advances in our knowledge have been welded almost seamlessly into S.'s account; his control of the material is a remarkable testament to the undiminished powers of one of our most distinguished living classical archaeologists, now in his nineties.

The introductory essay of the first edition has been retained but much enlarged and made to focus upon a chronological survey of portrait production. Discussions of the aims, significance, and semiotics of ancient portraiture formerly in this section have been transferred to a separate essay at the end, where they join excellent reviews of the history of research ('Stand der Forschung'), and of the transmission and survival of ancient portraits ('Überlieferung der antiken Bildniskunst'), originally incorporated in an appendix. Between these two essays the nucleus of the book is formed by the illustrated catalogue, again extensively enlarged by comparison with the first edition. Not only are there many more illustrations (over half as many again), but most of those used in the first edition have been replaced by new ones of superior quality. Many catalogue entries are entirely new, and those which have been retained are modified, where appropriate, to embody new identifications. All are expanded to take account of the recent literature.

The chief novelty of S.'s approach has been to get away from the standard treatment of portraits as aspects of the biography of the persons portrayed and to look at them as documents for the mentality of the generations that created them: he is concerned, in other words, to demonstrate how the portraits of a given individual changed according to the conceptions of different periods. The portraits are arranged, therefore, not by the dates of their subjects but by the dates of their manufacture. Along with this go numerous challenging ideas, e.g. on how gesture, posture, and dress define the subject's sphere of competence (even his particular philosophical school), and on the essential difference in Greek times between portrait statues of the famous and the representations of ordinary people on their grave-monuments (the former were individualized, while the latter tended to conform to ideal types).

S. is a master of generalization. The problem is that many of the bases for his generalizations are unsafe. Reliance on *Zeitgeist* as a guiding principle is particularly problematic when so few portraits are securely dated by external evidence: there is a real danger that works will be dated from preconceptions about the style of a period, then be used themselves as the basis for further generalizations about the taste of the time. It is worrying that S. is willing to assign works to specific decades, or conversely to classify versions of a portrait which (to my eye) do not appear

radically different to totally different centuries, solely on the basis of a subtle sense of artistic form. Another distinguished student of ancient portraits, Klaus Fittschen, who is politely criticized on p. 454, arrives at divergent dates for a number of the pieces discussed. Recently, B. S. Ridgway has argued (*AJA* 102 [1998], 717–38) that the statue of Anacreon believed to be a copy of a dedication of Pericles on the Athenian Acropolis (S.'s Fig. 34) may have been a classicistic creation of the Roman period; at all events, there are no firm grounds for the link with Pericles or the traditional dating. The truth is that many of the traditional dates given to ancient portraits, even when supposedly founded on objective criteria, are highly suspect. Doubts apply to identifications too. Among those adopted in S.'s catalogue, the following are at best uncertain, at worst implausible: Figs 11 (Sappho), 15 (Anacreon), 16–17 (Chilon and Solon: here the identifications involve assuming that the vase-painter attached the names to the wrong figures!), 25 (Themistocles—surely Zeus!), 29 (Archilochus), 35–6 (Anacharsis), 39 (Diotima), 49 (Conon), 50 and 64 (Aristophanes), 53 (Sophocles), 60–1 (Sappho), 72 (Aristippus), 73 (Solon), 83 (Socrates and Diotima), 143 (Menedemus), 149–50 (Aristophanes), 162 and 185 (Pindar), 163 (Aratus—the accompanying Muse is surely not Urania but Calliope or Clio), 167 (Theocritus—perhaps Menander?), 186 (Sappho), 187 (Archilochus), 188 (Homer).

This is a major book, but readers need to be aware of the extent to which its premises are speculative. They should also use it in conjunction with Paul Zanker's recent book *The Mask of Socrates: the Image of the Intellectual in Antiquity* (Berkeley, 1995). This adopts the same period-by-period approach, but puts more emphasis on the generalities of portrayal, less on the actual individuals portrayed, and is distinctly more cautious in identifying subjects.

University of Manchester ROGER LING

A. M. L. Touati: *Ancient Sculptures in the Royal Museum. The Eighteenth-century Collection in Stockholm*, *1*. Pp. 176, 53 ills, 43 pls. Stockholm: Swedish National Art Museum, 1998. Cased. ISBN: 91-7100-567-6.

The Royal Museum in Stockholm houses an important collection of ancient sculpture, acquired by Swedish royalty in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, which became the contents of a public museum in 1794. Gustav III, in particular, bought some 200 pieces in Rome between 1784 and 1789, transactions which carry with them a rich vein of accompanying documentation, now in the Royal Library and the State Archive.

Part two of the present volume provides a descriptive and historical catalogue of the fifteen major pieces of the collection, of which the star is a sleeping Endymion found in 1783 at Hadrian's Villa at Tivoli; Gustav III acquired it in the teeth of expectation that it would go to the Vatican, as recorded in a letter from Francesco Piranesi to the King's curator C. F. Fredenheim. With it came a set of four cipollino column shafts, with modern capitals and bases, originally described as coming from the same room as the Endymion, but more plausibly from the Piazza d'Oro, and the 'Minerva Pacifera', an Athena belonging to the well-documented Ince type, which reflects a Greek original of the late fifth or early fourth century B.C. This last has an alien head. The remaining sculptures given the catalogue treatment were acquired from the engraver and dealer Giovanni Volpato in 1784, as a group of Muses. Piranesi's letter to Fredenheim about this group provides a heady atmospheric whiff of the far from squeaky-clean antiquities market of Rome in the 1780s and 90s: 'à l'exception de quelqu'une les autres ne sont pas ni belles, ni Muses, comme vous verrez on les a restaurées à son gré: la tête de l'Apollon est la plus vilaine qu'on puisse voir.' We may allow for pique on Piranesi's part at not having been involved in the purchase; the documentation makes it clear, nonetheless, that the deliberate assembly of this group from disparate material, and its extensive restoration as a group of Muses, was known to art dealers and others in the antiquities market, and to the Director of the Vatican Museums at the time. The Apollo is not the only member of the group to have an alien or inappropriate head, but he has an interesting previous history. He was originally restored by Cavaceppi as a Muse, and published in his *Raccolta* in that guise. Comparison of the engraving with the current sculpture makes it clear that the head and the kithara have undergone significant alteration in the re-restoration. All the other Muses in the group have had bulges concealed, bags disguised, and new parts where desirable, and the photographs which accompany the catalogue show us the

evidence of surgery by dotting the modern sections. The catalogue makes absorbing reading precisely because of its deadpan reportage of some, by modern standards, very shady activity.

The earlier part of the volume builds on what the catalogue research reveals, and provides extended discussion of the history of the collection and its place in the context of eighteenth-century connoisseurship of classical antiquities. Because Touati headed a scientific project, it goes further than many parallel treatments in discussing the way in which antiquities were regarded and physically treated for display, in itself an important contribution to the history of museum objects and their care. There is, however, the added opportunity to explore the evolution of iconographic studies, our understanding of the original purposes and uses of some of the material, and changing attitudes to authenticity, restoration, and display. This gives the present volume a wider audience than its relatively modest format suggests; it is very engaging to read, with some splendid illustrations, not least of the major players in the acquisitions game documented in the chapter on the Middlemen. I recommend F. Piranesi's drawing of G. B. Piranesi's monument, a figure of the master trying to look like Cicero.

University of Glasgow ELIZABETH MOIGNARD

R. E. L. B. De Kind: *Houses in Herculaneum. A New View on the Town Planning and the Building of Insulae III and IV*. Pp. vi + 332, 27 plans. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1988. Cased, Hfl. 145. ISBN: 90-5063-517-2.

Relatively little attention has been paid to the excavations at Herculaneum in recent publications on housing and urban living in the Roman world. This is hard to justify: the city contains not only examples of Roman housing but also the evidence for the relationship between patronage and urban development. An inscription records the decree of the *ordo* on the death of their patron, Nonius Balbus. It stipulates that an equestrian statue was to be erected at the busiest part of the city, a marble altar where he had been cremated was constructed, and an annual procession from this location in his honour was made at the Parentalia. This epigraphic evidence alongside a general discussion of the literary evidence and history of the excavations drawing on recent scholarship is included in De Kind's monograph. But this is not his major concern: he wishes to establish the methods of planning and land division in two completely excavated *insulae* (III and IV) that contain twenty-five of the fifty-two extant houses from Herculaneum. To do this he has taken measurements of the houses and produced new plans of the houses themselves. From these data, he has analysed the relationship between the elements of the plans of the houses and the *insulae*. This metrical analysis is elaborate and fairly heavy going, but the results justify the effort involved. With reference to the layout of the city, D.K. finds that it corresponds to measurements in Oscan feet: the streets are exactly eight Oscan feet wide, *Insula* III measures 300 × 150 Oscan feet, the overall unit of planning was that of the *versus* (100′ × 100′) rather than the *actus* (120′ × 120′), and the division of plot frontages within the *insulae* corresponds most easily to Oscan rather than Roman feet. This overall system works well, but when applied to *Insula* IV D.K. has to resolve the inconsistencies with reference to explanations that emphasize the location of the *insula* in a peripheral position (p. 77), rather than within his framework of metrical analysis. This might highlight a weakness in the overall argument for a systematic usage of one set of measurements in the division of all the *insulae* at Herculaneum. There is also an underlying assumption to the work that it is possible from the built structures to move back from the destruction phase of A.D. 79 via stylistic dating to the earliest building phases. Recent excavation in Pompeii has shown that such assumptions should made with extreme caution (see Fulford and Wallace-Hadrill, *Antiquity* 72 [1998], 128–45).

The description and analysis of the actual houses takes up much of the book: each house is catalogued with discussion of bibliography, plan, wall construction, decoration, inscriptions, published finds, building history, metrological analysis, and design. This will provide a useful tool for those approaching the study of houses in Herculaneum, particularly when a similar study of *Insulae* V and VI by Leen Dresen is also published. From this thick description, D.K. defines a classificatory typology for the twenty-five houses under discussion. He divides the houses into eight different categories according to frontage width and internal arrangement. This seems

over-elaborate since some of his categories contain only one example. What the results do show, though, are that the classic atrium style house is poorly represented at Herculaneum, and that there were numerous different forms of domestic space that were utilized for urban living in the town. This finding is in line with others (see A. Wallace-Hadrill, 'Rethinking the Roman *Atrium* House', in R. Laurence, A. Wallace-Hadrill [edd.], *Domestic Space in the Roman World: Pompeii and Beyond*, *JRA* suppl. 22 [1997], 219–40). The variation in structure of the houses in these two *insulae* is striking and requires explanation in terms of the social variation or stylistic choice in the structure of domestic space. This is beyond the scope of D.K.'s analysis and would need a full discussion of decoration and an approach that drew on other methodologies of urban analysis. In many ways, we are still finding out how little we understand about the Vesuvian cities. D.K. has produced an interesting study that will aid scholars in the search for explanations of the structure of housing and urbanism at Herculaneum.

University of Reading RAY LAURENCE

S. T. A. M. Mols: *Wooden Furniture in Herculaneum. Form, Technique and Function*. Pp. 321, 201 ills. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1999. Cased, Hfl. 345. ISBN: 90-5063-317-X.

This book has a rather dry title, but readers should not be deterred by this. There is a wealth of new evidence in the book that has a particular significance for the study of housing, religion, and city life. The preservation of wood was first achieved at Herculaneum in the 1920s by soaking the material in paraffin wax (pp. 28–9), hence our sample of wooden house fittings is limited to the forty-one found since that date—all of which are published in this volume. The book includes a catalogue description of each item and lavish illustrations. Many of the items in the book do not appear in earlier excavation reports (p. 27). To illustrate the importance of this book in this brief review, I will take the example of wooden house shrines to show how the unique survival of these items alters our perspective of the past as constructed from sites in which wood does not survive. The general view that a house shrine would be in a public space or one associated with food preparation (Foss in R. Laurence, A. Wallace-Hadrill, *Domestic Space in the Roman World: 196–218*) is challenged by Mols's discussion of the wooden evidence from Herculaneum. He locates all of the shrines in the bedrooms of four houses: two shrines were found on the upper floors of houses in rooms in which beds were also found, the third example was located in a downstairs room in which there was a bed, and the fourth example is relocated to another room with a bed. The shrines take the form of a temple façade with a *cella* and two Corinthian columns in antis on a podium, and are closely comparable to the reconstructed Compitum Acilii from Rome (see Beard, North, Price, *Roman Religions* vol. 1, p. 185 for illustration). The *cella* of the shrine in the bedroom of Casa a Graticcio contained statuettes of Jupiter, Aesculapius, Diana, Minerva, Harpocrates, two of Fortuna, and the Lares themselves, as well as other items such as a bronze weight, a glass plate, bronze coins, and pieces of glass paste (p. 132). Apart from in these houses, evidence of this nature does not exist. This highlights the importance of the M.'s book, which takes us into a world we simply do not have evidence for on other sites or in the literary sources (but see Petr. *Sat*. 29.8). Clearly, household religion could be conducted in the bedroom on the first floor of a house. These examples show us that there is much even in the Vesuvian cities that has not survived from the past. M. succeeds in relating the limited preservation of wooden furniture in the houses of Herculaneum to the major debates on the Roman house, the economy, woodworking techniques, and religion. The book as a whole is a glance into a material world that literally does not survive on other sites or has been lost after excavation at Herculaneum. It is certainly worth reading this book, but at nearly £100 the price will be beyond most individuals and many libraries.

University of Reading RAY LAURENCE

J. LANCHA: *Mosaïque et culture dans l'Occident romain (I^er–IV^e s.)*. (Bibliotheca archaeologica 20.). Pp. 440, 13 colour pls, 1 folding colour pl., 126 b & w pls. Rome: 'L'Erma' di Bretschneider, 1997. ISBN: 88-7062-952-X.

The object of this monumental study is to catalogue and analyse all the mosaic pavements of the Roman West which show literary or philosophical subjects. Italy is specifically excluded because the author's object is to examine the diffusion of classical culture in provinces where no literary tradition had existed prior to the Roman period. Media other than mosaic are excluded because certain classes of material, such as sarcophagi with representations of Muses, have been well studied by others, and because mosaics, which form an essential part of the domestic environment, can be expected to provide a unique insight into the tastes and values of the householders who commissioned them. The nucleus of the book is the catalogue, which fills 261 pages and includes 126 items, not just surviving pavements but also some known only from drawings; this is followed by a 110-page synthesis, which reviews the subjects represented, the other subjects that are associated with them, the architectural contexts in which they occur, the evidence for variations in the popularity of different themes from province to province, and the significance of the inscriptions which accompany certain representations.

The result is a wonderfully rich compendium of material. The catalogue alone is an invaluable contribution, since many of the items are virtually unpublished and others are given new interpretations or new dates. The main area where reservations can be expressed is in the criteria of selection. To the nucleus of material formed by the Muses mosaics and by representations of poets and philosophers are added various 'literary and dramatic subjects'. This leads to considerable blurring at the margins. It is questionable how far some of the subjects included, such as the hunt of the Calydonian boar or the discovery of Achilles on Skyros, can be regarded as providing evidence of literary culture when others, such as the rape of Hylas, a familiar subject in Latin poetry, are omitted. The author is at pains to set out the ground-rules for distinguishing what she calls 'literary scenes' from 'mythological scenes'—the presence of a literary inscription, relation to a major text rather than a minor one, the depiction of more than one phase of a story, combination with other subjects known from literature (pp. 297–300). But this methodology produces a succession of anomalies. In some cases representations of the same subject are now included (because, according to L., the context suggests a cultural rôle), now disregarded (because, she claims, the context shows that the original meaning is lost). For certain subjects, such as the farewell of Briseis, L. argues for literary inspiration but admits that the versions in mosaic follow long-established iconographic models. Rather than expressing a patron's literary interests, could not such scenes simply reflect independent patterns of transmission and imitation within the visual arts? In other words, did the patron not merely pick a favourite and familiar story, using a pattern-book offered to him by the mosaic workshop? On a different point, it is difficult to understand how, if the author's aim is to illustrate acculturation in the western provinces, she can justify including areas such as Sicily and the coastal fringes of Narbonnensis and Tarraconensis where there had been a long tradition of Greek culture before the coming of the Romans.

In a work so packed with detail it is impossible to discuss every facet of interpretation. One or two corrections and addenda on British mosaics must suffice. The wolf and twins mosaic from Aldborough (no. 118) is wrongly claimed to be part of a five-octagon scheme: the author has apparently confused it with the 'haunches of venison' pavement from York. At Brading, Isle of Wight (no. 121), the identification of Anaximander has now been challenged, and any philosophical or religious reading of the mosaics should probably be discounted: see *Britannia* 22 (1991), 148–53. For the Apollo and Marsyas mosaic from Lenthay Green, Dorset (no. 122), L. is unaware of some recent bibliography: see e.g. *Britannia* 14 (1983), 20 (indicating that the figure of Apollo is largely a modern restoration); P. B. Rawson, *The Myth of Marsyas in the Roman Visual Arts* (BAR International Series 347) (1987), 122, no. 14 (this monograph is worth citing also for other Apollo and Marsyas mosaics). Finally, to the examples of mosaics featuring the Muses should probably be added the so-called Tyche pavement from Brantingham, Yorkshire: see *Britannia* 22 (1991), 154–6.

University of Manchester ROGER LING

M. L. Neira, T. Mañanes: *Mosaicos romanos de Valladolid.* (Corpus de mosaicos de España, 11.) Pp. 128, 10 ills, 24 b &w pls, 16 colour pls. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1998. ISBN: 84-00-07716-4.

G. López Monteagudo, R. Navarro Sáez, P. De Palol Salellas: *Mosaicos romanos de Burgos.* (Corpus de mosaicos de España, 12.) Pp. 170, 26 ills, 30 b & w pls, 20 colour pls. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1998. ISBN: 84-00-07721-0.

The corpus of Roman mosaics of Spain continues apace. While the first nine fascicules published material from the southern, eastern, and central regions, the latest two follow Fasc. X (León and Asturias) in focusing upon the north-west. In each case there are several items of interest. Pride of place goes to the mythological figure-panels. From Almenara de Adaja comes a scene of the toilet of Pegasus, unique in that Pegasus lacks wings. From Cubezón de Pisuerga comes a scene of warriors interpreted, ingeniously if not conclusively, as representing the Homeric duel between Diomedes and Glaucus, and their subsequent exchange of arms. The most intriguing aspect of this scene is the apparent mixing of Greek and Roman elements, notably a Greek inscription above the heads of the first pair of figures and a Latin one above the second pair. From Baños de Valdearados comes a late antique pavement depicting a Bacchic rout above a scene of Bacchus in his triumphal chariot. From Cardeñajimo there is a sadly incomplete version (late antique again) of the Calydonian boar-hunt. Also of interest are some distinctive decorative motifs, which can provide a basis for identifying local workshops: a curious shaded border in five mosaics of the Valladolid region, for example, and various forms of scale pattern around Burgos.

The iconographical analyses and the discussions of patterns and motifs are commendably thorough. Where the series falls down, suffering particularly by comparison with the excellent corpora being produced in France and Tunisia, is in the matters of contextualization and illustration. Missing from all the fascicules are regional maps, which would enable the reader to locate obscure places named in no atlas. For the individual architectural contexts, while plans and descriptions are often included, it is usually very difficult to relate the one to the other or to establish the position of the mosaics, especially where (as with Almenara de Adaja) the plan lacks the numbers and letters used to define rooms in the text. In the otherwise exemplary survey of the mosaics of Clunia in an appendix that occupies more than half the Burgos fascicule, untold confusion is created by the use of different numbering systems for rooms and mosaics. Added to this, the descriptions of the mosaics themselves are often difficult to follow because of inadequate illustrations. The photographs are variable in quality and patchy in their coverage; the drawings, while good for some sites, are poor or non-existent for others. If the descriptions were fuller and more methodical, this would be less of a problem; but, given that they tend to be superficial, the need for a higher standard of illustration is imperative. For such improvements in documentation I would gladly have sacrificed some of the lengthy discussions of comparanda. The latter too often degenerate into undiscriminating lists drawn from all periods and all parts of the Mediterranean; a more selective analysis, especially in the Valladolid fascicule, would surely have brought more illuminating insights into patterns of mutual influence and the transmission of ideas from one region to another.

It is both a strength and a weakness of the Spanish corpus that it is being produced quickly and economically. We should be grateful that mosaics previously published only in periodicals and excavation reports that are difficult to obtain in other countries are now being brought together in an accessible series. It is sad, however, that this series does not always measure up to the standards that we have come to expect of mosaics corpora.

University of Manchester ROGER LING

G. Capecchi, O. Paoletti, C. Cianferoni, A. M. Esposito, A. Romualdi (edd.): *In Memoria di Enrico Paribeni*. (Archaeologica 125.) Pp. 539 (2 vols), tables. Rome: Giorgio Bretschneider, 1998. Paper, L. 1,400,000. ISBN: 88-7689-141-2.

Enrico Paribeni died in 1993 aged eighty-two, after a long career in which he had served the cause of classical art and archaeology as a distinguished excavator, administrator, and scholar of very wide experience within his chosen field. His own bibliography includes site reports, museum catalogues, numerous entries in the *Enciclopedia dell'Arte Antica*, reviews, *Corpus Vasorum* fascicles and articles which testify to his knowledge of Greek, Etruscan, and Roman material, and to the overlaps between the three cultures, and to his talents as an interpreter of a variety of material, beyond a central interest in figured ceramics.

The contributors to these two volumes in his memory reflect both that knowledge and P.'s place in a network of international scholarship with broadly the same aims. Over fifty articles, largely traditional in methodology and format, both analytical and descriptive, range from goldwork to ceramics to cult practice, and from Elba to Lemnos. Many of the contributors use the opportunity of a short article to echo P.'s writing patterns in establishing a group of similar items as the output of a single workshop, or to provide a context for an iconographic phenomenon; others deal with inscriptions, provide ceramic shape-studies, or discuss the effects of materials on form. There is, naturally enough, a predominant interest in the patchily Hellenized material culture of the Italian peninsula in the archaic and classical periods, which chimes with P.'s evident determination not to pigeonhole his knowledge, but to make connections. Many of the contributions will be standard points of reference for their material, and that too is an appropriate memorial for a scholar whose writings made accessibility to others a yardstick.

University of Glasgow ELIZABETH MOIGNARD

P. Baehr: *Caesar and the Fading of the Roman World. A Study in Republicanism and Caesarism*. Pp. viii + 359. New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers, 1998. Cased, £39.95. ISBN: 1-56000-304-9.

In 1894, the German historian and left-wing intellectual Ludwig Quidde published his famous satire *Caligula*, subtitled 'a study on Caesarean madness in Rome' (*Eine Studie über römischen Caesarenwahnsinn*), in which he drew a parallel between the notorious Roman emperor and Wilhelm II, and severely criticized his society for having produced such a caricature of an absolute monarch. The book was an immediate success, but Quidde was socially and academically ostracized, ousted from his duties, charged with *lèse-majesté*, and his periodical, the *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaft*, collapsed. Caesarean madness was according to Quidde's acute analysis not an individual affliction, but the product of circumstances which only flourish through the moral degeneration of a nation inclined to monarchy or, at least, of the upper classes which constitute the ruler's entourage.

Quidde's outstanding contribution to the controversial debate about 'Caesarism', i.e. the depravation of Caesarism, has been ignored by Peter Baehr, a Canadian sociologist, who wants to present a study of 'Caesar's significance for republican thought, the specific debate around Caesarism in the nineteenth century and the transmutation of this debate during the twentieth' (p. 16). However, the core of the book is the 'nineteenth-century cultural conversation' about Caesar (p. 7), and B. has actually produced a study of Max Weber's concept of Caesarism. Weber, in his political sociology, defined Caesarism as a sort of charismatic leadership and plebiscitary democracy exemplified by Cromwell, Robespierre, Napoleon I, and Napoleon III, and analysed the suitability of this concept, as well as of Napoleonism, Bonapartism, and imperialism, for understanding modern societies. B. also surveys the origins and development of the term Caesarism within republican thinking from Machiavelli to Marx, and highlights its significance for some of Weber's contemporaries, like Wilhelm Roscher and Albert Schäffle, and for modern sociologists. Special emphasis is put on Caesar's reception in the political discourse of North America. B. thus illustrates the transformation of Julius Caesar as a symbol for anti-republican tendencies like demagogy, tyranny, and corruption into a shining example of rational leadership

based upon the consensus of the 'masses'. During this process of rehabilitation the concept of Caesarism was coined. The section on nineteenth-century Europe, on the controversial and polemic debates about the Caesarism of Louis Bonaparte and Otto von Bismarck, corroborates *in extenso* the short, but illuminating article of Dieter Groh in the first volume of *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe* (Stuttgart, 1972), pp. 726–71, on which B. often relies.

B. deals with a vast subject, and thus it is not surprising that brilliant characterizations (e.g. of Mommsen's depiction of Caesar in his *History of Rome*, pp. 170–3) alternate with omissions and shortcomings. The selection of examples sometimes seems to be eclectic; some theoretical reflexions on the term 'republicanism' would have been welcome; 'the reception of Caesar in historical scholarship, the popular novel and the arts' (p. 10) has only received marginal attention, and recent contributions to the subject by classicists have been overlooked (I only refer to Karl Christ's fundamental study on *Caesar. Annäherungen an einen Diktator* [Munich, 1994]). B. also largely ignores the new critical edition of Max Weber's collected works (*Max-Weber-Gesamtausgabe*) sponsored by the Bavarian Academy. For the chapter on 'Weber as a Student of Antiquity' (pp. 169–74) Jürgen Deininger's edition of *Die römische Agrargeschichte in ihrer Bedeutung für das Staats- und Privatrecht* ('The Significance of Roman Agrarian History for Public and Private Law') (Tübingen, 1986) is of crucial importance, but unknown to B.

This is not the place to discuss B.'s ardent pleading for a co-existence of Christianity and civility (pp. 20–6), but it should be said that the final chapter on 'The Caesar Phenomenon in Its Time' (pp. 287–313) is meant 'to make plain the uniqueness of the entity I am about to discuss, and to signal a refusal to absorb, "transcend", or dismiss earlier concepts or debates by the formulation of a new academic coinage purporting to show what Caesarism *really* is' (p. 286). B., in other words, tries to summarize recent research on Caesar and the Late Republic for a non-specialist audience. The author rightly notes 'the gradual loss of Caesar as a potent symbol of argument in Western civilization' and laments 'the development not of a postmodern, but of a postclassical, postrepublican political culture' (p. 16). Having read this book, I am not inclined to contradict him.

Universität Mannheim STEFAN REBENICH

A. CARSON: *Economy of the Unlost. Reading Simonides of Keos with Paul Celan*. Pp. viii + 147. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999. Cased, $18.95. ISBN: 0-691-03677-2.

Dear Anne,

I have been wanting to write to you since I spent a piercingly bright spring day by the lake in Princeton, your old haunt, reading *Plainwater* and *Autobiography of Red*, cover to cover, with increasing pleasure and awe. If *Plainwater*'s fragments and shards made up a world of wryness and seeping pain to set against your bittersweet Greek lyric masters, *Autobiography of Red* found a narrative line not just of an old erotic novel but also of a pilgrim's journey. As Saint Jerome asked, 'How can one travel through the landscape of passion without passion?'. Poems, you write, demand a particular form of attention, and both your interwoven tale of Red and your lyric tesserae produced in me, travelling, an intensity of attention I have long longed to repay.

Eros the Bittersweet—now fourteen years old—with its crimson warning jacket, despite coming garlanded with praise by some old white men, could not fully escape the *rumores senum severiorum*. I do not know if you became immured to the reactions, exhilarated, or desperate. As I require my students to understand the passions and rigours of philology and thus control the power of knowing, while also insisting that facing the question of what is at stake always trumps the observance of the pieties of a profession, *Eros the Bittersweet* still remains an exemplary provocation, a test-case. *Economy of the Unlost* will do the same—with knobs on.

Your decision to read Simonides with and even through Paul Celan is risking it all. Can Celan, whose crushed and bleeding words attempt to articulate the most profound horrors of the twentieth century—and end in a suicidal death by water—really illuminate and be illuminated by a fifth-century B.C.E. poet, who wrote epitaphs for money and whose griefs highlight the insult of not getting snow in his drink like the other sympotic guests?

'Tiefimschnee,
Iefimnee,
i - - i - - e'
['Deepinsnow
Eeepinow,
e - - i - - o']

ends one Celan poem, paradigmatically collapsing into mere vowels. Can the almost unbearable pain of Celan's melting into near silence (and this in a poem which began 'KEINE SANDKUNST MEHR', 'NO MORE SAND ART') be brought up against Simonides' lack of chilled wine?

Well, the seriousness of the modernist attention you lavish on Simonides is profoundly stimulating, in part because you take even fragments as significant products of a poetic mentality, and above all because the interconnectedness of Simonides' varied output reveals in your reading a fascinating network of cultural questions which establish Simonides as an icon of the fifth-century arrival into enlightenment. You sense that his writing for money marks a real moment in the poetics of exchange and needs to be seen in relation to his rôle in establishment of the genre of the epitaph—*its* logic of performance and exchange. This importantly resituates Simonides (both his poems and the stories he evokes) as a telling cultural event in the fifth century. What is more, Simonides' invention of the science of memory at Scopas' court is recounted as a story which also evokes principles of *charis* between man and man, and man and god, which further intertwines his image into a broader set of concerns about social intercourse. I found that your readings repeatedly opened new vistas: for which, much thanks.

I could—of course?—do the severe old man thing. After all, it is quite a leap of faith you take when you insist on taking Strabo's story that every social-minded chap in Ceos took hemlock when reaching age 60 (cf. Aldous Huxley's *Brave New World*) as a true and insightful guide to Simonides' life and as constructive of his sense of having cheated death in some way. And the reading of the 'Spinther' fragment (*AP* 7.177)—as you will remember from your trip to Cambridge—will make philologists splutter, even with your new almost apologetic footnotes! The social history, with Marx, is barely enough to frame your textual insights. . . . But what set me most worrying was whether, in the end, the inconcinnity of Celan and Simonides was too painfully disruptive. How far is Celan's excruciating and almost unhinged textual stuttering from Simonides' salvaging of praise? I cannot help feeling that a crucial difference between Celan's death fugues from the Holocaust and Simonides' memorials for military men was being perhaps too quickly occluded. But I also think that that is what you would like me to be thinking about.

And so I will just say that Greek lyric poetry is all too forgotten as a truly exciting and powerful element in the Western poetic tradition. But you help us remember.

Yours,

King's College, Cambridge SIMON GOLDHILL

M. FUSILLO: *La Grecia secondo Pasolini: mito e cinema*. (Biblioteca di Cultura, 209.) Pp. vi + 273. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1996. Paper, L. 25,000. ISBN: 88-221-1760-3.

Pier Paolo Pasolini was one of the most provocative and controversial figures in the cultural history of post-war Italy. Journalist, essay-writer, novelist, poet, film critic, and film maker, he is known to classicists only through his films *Edipo Re* and *Medea*. In this book Massimo Fusillo shows that Pasolini's fascination with ancient Greece is evident right from his early career in Friuli when he translated Sappho into the local language. The bulk of the book is about cinema and theatre, the two genres in which Greek myth was most favoured by Pasolini. F. shows that in his cinema Pasolini constructs a barbaric, pre-rational image of ancient Greece, the product of non-verbal languages, rites, gestures, music, human bodies, and deserted landscapes. In his theatre, on the other hand, Pasolini privileged a vision of Greek drama which depends wholly on language and its educational character. The different orientations of Pasolini's cinema and theatre reflect not only the different audiences for which they were meant, but also the deep inconsistencies and paradoxes of his provocative and controversial thought.

F.'s is the fullest up-to-date analysis of Pasolini's representations of ancient Greece and the first full-scale attempt to examine the relevant work in the light of the ideological and political preoccupations which inform the rest of Pasolini's *oeuvre*. The book consists of an introduction followed by three chapters exploring Pasolini's re-writings of Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus*, Euripides' *Medea*, and Aeschylus' *Oresteia*. The first chapter is a study of the film *Edipo Re*, produced in 1967, and of the drama *Affabulazione*, published in 1969. F. argues that *Edipo Re* is about the violent transition of the anti-intellectual Oedipus from the atemporal physicality of the barbaric sub-proletariat to knowledge and the modern reality of the bourgeoisie. The drama *Affabulazione*, on the other hand, focuses on the 'Laius' complex' and explores one of Pasolini's favourite themes, namely the relation between father and son. Both works show Pasolini's fascination with myth, psychoanalysis, and autobiography. The second chapter deals with the film *Medea*, produced in 1970. The film explores the cultural conflict between *Medea*'s archaic world and the modern world of Jason, which is pervaded by aggressive colonialism and cynical pragmatism. The third chapter looks at Pasolini's translation of Aeschylus' *Oresteia* (1960), the drama *Pylades* (started in 1966), and the film documentary *Appunti per un' Orestiade africana* (1969). These three re-writings of the *Oresteia* are suggestive of Pasolini's gradual abandonment of his utopian view of a society in which the world of magic and the sacred can be fused with modern rationality.

The three chapters provide an equal number of readings of Greek myth, shifting from psychoanalysis to social anthropology to politics. F.'s approaches reveal Pasolini's wide range of interests as well as his changing attitudes towards Greek antiquity. The three readings in this book provide us with complementary aspects of Pasolini's vision of 'barbaric Greece'. The oxymoron of a Greece which is barbaric sheds light on Pasolini's reaction against the neo-classical rationalization and idealization of ancient Greece, a reaction which is informed by Pasolini's profound interest in Freud, social anthropology, and Marxism. F. argues that the metaphor of barbaric Greece needs to be seen in the more general context of Pasolini's reaction against the 'nuova preistoria'—the de-historicization brought about, and the exclusion of the pre-rational imposed, by neo-capitalism.

F. works within a theoretical field which is familiar from the collective volume *Pasolini e l'antico: i doni della ragione*, ed. U. Todini (Naples, 1995), as well as from the earlier studies of B. Amengual (in M. Estève [ed.], *Pier Paolo Pasolini: le mythe et le sacré*, 1976), S. Snyder (*Pier Paolo Pasolini*, 1980), and E. Golino (*Pasolini: il sogno di una cosa*, 1985). For those, however, who are not familiar with the massive literature Pasolini has inspired in the course of the last twenty-five years, F.'s interpretative approach is not always lucid. The compiling of a thematic index would have been the first step towards a more reader-friendly presentation. Moreover, whereas F.'s detailed study of Pasolini's 'Greek' works throws light on their complex nexus of relations within the rest of Pasolini's *oeuvre*, one feels that Pasolini's shifting attitudes to Greek antiquity are not only symptomatic of the evolution of his thought, but also important for our mapping of his political and ideological stance(s).

The book contains illustrations, an index of personal names, and a useful bibliography (up to 1995) of studies on Pasolini's 'Greek' works. The book also contains an appendix where Pasolini's early translation of three fragments by Sappho is published for the first time.

Wolfson College, Oxford PANTELIS MICHELAKIS

P. HAMMOND: *Dryden and the Traces of Classical Rome*. Pp. x + 305. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999. Cased, £45. ISBN: 0-19-818411-5.

In *Dryden and the Traces of Classical Rome*, H. recreates the intricate and shifting interplay between Latin and English languages, Roman culture and late-seventeenth-century Britain, which permeates Dryden's output through his long writing career. Although a large body of scholarly work exists on the use of classical allusion by English writers, and on English translations of classical texts, this study breaks new ground, certainly where Dryden is concerned. This is a Dryden for the uncommon reader, one as well versed in Derrida and Barthes as in Virgil, Ovid, Lucretius, et al. Paradoxically, H. constructs a poststructuralist Dryden through subtly refining and revising his perceived relation to the ancients. While performing the courtesy for non-classicists of providing translations of all the Latin passages quoted—thus allowing comparisons with Dryden's own variations—he makes it clear that to maximize the

reading experience requires a level of erudition which suggests that Dryden, like Milton, is writing for a fit audience, likely to be few among modern readers. The activity of uncovering 'traces'—a resonant term—in Dryden's texts involves H., and his readers, in patient excavation and interpretation of minutiae. His book facilitates such reading, by offering persuasive and exhaustively detailed specific analyses, braced with an informed and provocative theoretic structure.

H. elegantly frames the central discussion with 'Limen' and 'Theoxeny': the former opens up the dimensions of the subject by juxtaposing two works of art concerned with imagined origins and (dis)continuities, Claude Lorrain's painting, *Landscape with Aeneas at Delos*, and Dryden's poem 'To my Dear Friend Mr. Congreve'; the latter closes it with a similarly transformed *locus*, Dryden's 'Baucis and Philemon'. Between these defining points, H. ranges from Dryden's earliest political poetry to his 1690s translations, tracking a changing relationship with the Roman poets who inhabit his writing as (in H.'s metaphor) guests and/or ghosts. He divides the material into two interrelated sections, 'Quotation' and 'Translation'. The first situates Dryden's complicated engagement with Latin, and myths of origin, within the displaced and shifting discourses of his contemporary culture. H. contests the view that the Roman past is simply being used to authorize Restoration ideology; instead, the interplay of past and present in Dryden's work is much more disturbing, questioning, and fruitful, based on awareness of difference/*différance*. Dryden defamiliarizes and revises classical allusion and quotation in innovatory ways. H. is particularly interesting and subtle when unravelling Dryden's misquotations, which he attributes to creative appropriation rather than accident (though confronted with such fine nuances, the reader might be moved to wonder whether there may not be instances where a misquotation is just a misquotation). Throughout, the argument gains strength through its cumulativeness and exactness. As a Dryden editor, H. is alert to linguistic detail—for example, Dryden's insertion of 'pious' as a crucial signifier in various contexts—but he also takes the larger view, showing how such detail corresponds to Dryden's imagining of time and space as multiple, overlaying a period of British history characterized by conflict and transition with a montage of Roman precedents. His reading therefore links Dryden's appropriation of the classical past with an identity crisis which is both national and personal. This theme continues into Part 2, which focuses on a sequence of exemplary close analyses of Dryden's translations from Horace, Juvenal, Lucretius, and above all Virgil, in relation to Dryden's own translation theory. These offer insight not only into Dryden's preoccupation with 'Mutability and Metamorphosis' (Chapter III), encompassing a variety of familiar motifs from the deaths of young men to *beatus ille*, but also into a whole continuum of originals, commentaries, and other translations. If 'all translation entails the management of loss' (p. 147), by showing what is lost *and* gained in the process, H.'s commentary sharpens the reader's consciousness of both Virgil's and Dryden's linguistic choices (as when describing Priam's death scene). In the final chapter, 'The Epic of Exile', H. teases out the political implications of Dryden's *Aeneis* for the problematic conditions of 1690s England while refusing to allegorize or oversimplify the poetry. It is this respect for textual encounters of the classical kind, whether conducted as critic, translator, editor, or reader, that make this such a demanding and rewarding contribution to the scholarship of the humanities.

King's College London CHRISTINE REES

D. KURTZ (ed.): *Bernard Ashmole 1894–1988: an Autobiography*. Pp. xvii + 235, 66 ills. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 1994. ISBN: 0946897-68-9.

Published in the centenary year of his birth, this volume presents Ashmole's autobiography accompanied by some short pieces relating to the story and tributes by younger colleagues. Ashmole wrote what he entitled 'One Man in His Time' for his grandchildren rather than with an eye to publication, and it is not clear that he would have approved of its wider circulation, but the story is certainly eminently readable. Its interest is twofold: on one level it offers insight into the life and character of a highly influential scholar, while at another it provides a first-hand account of a significant stretch of twentieth-century history, 'a period not only of unparalleled technical developments but also of catastrophic events in the world at large' (p. xv). Ashmole's long career covered all the major posts a British Classical Archaeologist could aspire to—at various times he was Director of the British School at Rome, Keeper of the Greek and Roman Department of the British Museum, and held both the Yates Chair at UCL

and the Lincoln Chair at Oxford. And yet he comes across as an extremely modest man—he turned down several posts which were offered to him, and only accepted some of the ones he did after persuasion from friends. He also seems to have been very down-to-earth and practical in his approach to both life and scholarship, as illustrated by the many fascinating asides on technical problems for which he found solutions. See, for example, the account of the building of 'High and Over', the innovative house designed by Amyas Connell for the Ashmoles at Amersham, in 1929 (pp. 51–61), or of how Ashmole photographed the Ince Blundell sculpture collection in the early 1920s (pp. 32–5), or how he proved a bronze head, purporting to be an ancient copy of the Doryphoros, which had been sold to Paul Getty, to be a forgery (pp. 159–61). This is also apparent in Ashmole's accounts of the First and Second World Wars, which take up nearly half the autobiography. Everything is told in a very matter-of-fact, understated way, and with Ashmole's characteristic self-effacement we hear more about the actions of those around him than the part he played himself, though it is clear that he saw very active and distinguished service, first with the Royal Fusiliers and later with the RAF. Two appendices give the firsthand accounts of adventures of other members of his squadron, notably the gripping log of the *Scorpion*, the lifeboat in which twelve men from 84 Squadron escaped from Sumatra to Australia in 1942. The volume's value as a document of British social history is much enhanced by the sixty-six photographs, many by Ashmole himself. Family members appear throughout, from an 1896 shot of Ashmole's parents and siblings to a 1988 one of his wife Dorothy, and of general interest are pictures of the British Schools at Athens and Rome in the 1920s, and of the British Museum during the Second World War—see, for example, the sculpture being stored in the Underground at Aldwych in 1939 (pp. 71–2), and the damage done to the Greek and Roman rooms in 1941 (pp. 121–4).

University of Wales, Lampeter EMMA J. STAFFORD

K. Brodersen (ed.): *Große Gestalten der griechischen Antike. 58 historische Portraits von Homer bis Kleopatra*. Pp. 507. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1999. Cased. ISBN: 3-406-44893-3.

This elegant volume contains fifty-eight historical biographies from Homer to Cleopatra. Although the selection is understandably subjective, a conscious effort has been made to include not only kings, politicians, and generals, but also philosophers, intellectuals, artists, poets, historians, and scientists. The stated purpose of this book is to provide an insight into the history and culture of ancient Greece and its considerable impact upon the development of civilization by studying the lives of influential personalities. A good illustration of the underlying purpose of the book can be found in the article by E. Baltrusch, expounding the lives of Leonidas and Pausanias. The author contrasts the two most prominent Spartans from the Persian wars, presenting Leonidas as the ideal Spartan willing to die on the battlefield in defence of the ideals of his city, while Pausanias is the individualist, nonconformist Spartan. By means of this somewhat artificial contrast, the author intends to explore the topic of what Sparta stood for.

Most biographies included in this book offer a reliable first acquaintance with the person whose life they present. Sometimes the reader will find interesting accounts and proposals, like the exploration of Sophocles' existentialism by F. Krummen, the view of Herodotos as a cultural historian of immense significance by R. von Haehling, and the consideration of Isocrates as an intellectual rather than an orator by U. Walter. The balanced emphasis upon both aspects of Solon, as poet and statesman, by H. Brandt, succeeds in presenting an integrated portrait. G. Wöhrle in the biography of Hippocrates has had a difficult task in trying to separate Hippocratic mythology from Hippocratic science, and has responded to this challenge with sober judgement. Some of the accounts are quite scholarly, like the article on Aristophanes by B. Zimmermann, others are less so. In general, the biographies are written in simple, non-technical language which addresses the non-specialist reader.

As expected of a work which encompasses such diverse topics, and is the product of so many hands (around sixty scholars), it is uneven. One particular issue is certainly noteworthy: some authors diligently quote the sources (e.g. K. Meister on Thucydides), while others do not (e.g. A. Winterling on Aristotle). One could be led to the conclusion that there was no fixed editorial policy on the matter of the sources, and this diversity of practice proves restrictive for the reader. The absence of proper and meticulous references to the sources from the majority of

authors limits the usefulness of this book as a first resort. Students would probably be better off consulting more scholarly handbooks available in German (e.g. *Real-Encyclopädie*, *Kleine Pauly*, or now *Neue Pauly*) or in other languages (e.g. the third edition of the *OCD*), and scholars certainly have a much wider range of resources for this purpose.

The unevenness of the book is not confined to technical matters: for example, one wonders what purpose is served by giving the Greek names for various parts of the *Parabasis* (*pnigos*, *epirrhematic agon*, *ode*, *katakeleusmos*), while elsewhere in the book only the sketchiest account of the issues involved is provided. The bibliography (separate for each biography) reveals a similar degree of inconsistency. A selective bibliography is by definition subjective, but here I felt at times that the decision to include or exclude a study has had no rationale behind it. I must admit I could not understand the criteria according to which the basic and important book of O. Temkin, *Hippocrates in a World of Pagans and Christians* (Baltimore, 1991), was excluded from the relevant bibliography, while the more specialized, focused, and difficult study of Lichtenthaeler, *Der Eid des Hippokrates* (which I find valuable, but perhaps too technical for the beginner), has been included. Such differences in practice and quality made me wonder whether the editor had in mind a certain type of reader, and if so, what kind of reader that might be.

Even though objections on individual points are inevitable in a work of this size and diversity, the information is generally reliable. However, this book is not suitable for purposes of research, and it would probably prove unsatisfactory even for the needs of undergraduate students. It seems to me that it is aimed at the layperson with reading interests in history, the secondary school pupil, and someone who wishes to have a good general library at home. As such it can render some service to classical scholarship.

The Queen's University of Belfast K. KAPPARIS

S. HORNBLOWER, A. SPAWFORTH (edd.): *The Oxford Companion to Classical Civilization*. Pp. xxiv + 794, 5 maps, 22 pls. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1998. Cased, £30. ISBN: 0-19-860165-4.

CIL, *RIC*, *LIMC*, *CAH*, *TLG*, *PLRE*, etc. Will *OCCC* ever gain the currency enjoyed by other abbreviations in the world of Classics? I doubt it, because it is very much in the shadow of its parent volume, *OCD*^{3}; however, just in case, let us put on record our gratitude that this recent work does not come from CUP, i.e. would *CCCC* sound OK?

Companions are very much in vogue, but unlike the recent collections of essays on central topics (such as tragedy and Virgil), this volume is a more conventional reference work; in short it is a dictionary, 'in a cheaper and less weighty format' than *OCD*^{3} (preface). H. & S., the editors of both *OCD*^{3} and *OCCC*, have targeted the latter at the mythical general reader. Accordingly, well over 5000 entries have been jettisoned from *OCD*^{3}, plus all specialist bibliographies. With this exception, the articles which have survived the cull have not been edited, so I will not repeat the reaction published in *CR* 48 (1998), 461–3. New are a very brief general bibliography; five maps and over 150 illustrations, including sixteen pages of full colour; a chronological table (pp. 789–93), less useful than that in *OHCW*; and a thematic list of entries (pp. xi–xvi) which encourages useful guided browsing.

The presentation of *OCCC* has been given full consideration. It employs a larger font size than that used in *OCD*^{3}. Some longer and more discursive articles are presented on shaded backdrops with 'architectural' frame, perhaps for reasons more aesthetic than intellectual. The eye-catching illustrations are diverse in subject-matter; highlights include an iron cuirass with gold fittings from the royal tomb at Vergina, and the splendid full-colour 'Count of the Saxon Shore' from the *Notitia Dignitatum*. The dust jacket snaps of the editors are far from flattering; why do people do this?

So without dumbing down the central areas of classical scholarship, *OCCC* has its eye on a more popular market. Is this the inspiration for its title, which clearly picks up on the non-linguistic courses run at schools and universities? If so, students of Greek and Latin should not feel excluded. If *OCCC* encourages all students to make it their business to consult works of reference it will prove very useful. It is a very attractive volume, although its parent volume is by no means intimidating. In a sense, the biggest problem with *OCCC* is that *OCD*^{3} is so good. At under half the cost of *OCD*^{3}, *OCCC* is competitively priced, and might suit departmental or

school libraries on particularly tight budgets; but all institutions would be well-advised not to settle for anything less than *OCD*[3] if at all possible.

Trinity College Dublin ROGER REES

J. MARCH: *Dictionary of Classical Mythology*. Pp. 416, 2 maps, 148 ills. London: Cassell, 1998. Cased, £25. ISBN: 0-304-34626-8.

This is very much mythology for the millennium, a modern encyclopaedia of myth and legend which is user-friendly in layout, presentation, and style. There must be many scholars who have constantly consulted the pages of, say, Larousse, Lemprière, and Dr Smith, and who will continue to do so with admiration and affection. However, March's dictionary is a timely and much needed metamorphosis of the weighty and densely packed reference book. This Cassell production arrives at an opportune moment, and in just the right accessible format, given the continuing popularization of Classical Studies in the UK. It comes as no surprise to me that, at the time of writing, the Dictionary has already attracted one accolade, first prize in the Runciman Award.

M. has a straightforward but enthusiastic manner of retelling the myths. Scholarship is worn lightly throughout, so that tone as well as appearance lends the book an illusion of space and expansiveness. This is a considerable achievement given the comprehensiveness of the coverage. People, places, things, and monsters all merit entries, from the laconic to the helpfully detailed. Achilles, for instance, on pp. 14–16, allows for a moving resumé of Homer's *Iliad* and M. includes some translations (her own) direct from the Greek text.

I took the dictionary along to an Open University Summer School recently and the students tested out entries relevant to their study; Icarus, Pygmalion, Dionysius, and Medea, for example. From the students' point of view, M. certainly succeeds in her intention to be readable, lively, and informative (Introduction, p. 7). She does not clutter the individual narratives but she does make the reader aware of alternative and subsequent versions of famous and recondite myths.

High praise is also due for the clear, comprehensive, but economical referencing. As for the choice of illustrations, this displays a wide acquaintance with a range of visual evidence and, I would imagine, much painstaking work to acquire the pictures. M. has not gone for easy options here, and the book is the richer for the trouble she has taken to select the apt image. As Jeannie Cohen points out (*CA News*, 20 June 1999, p. 8), new and unexpected pictures appear as well as old faithfuls, and all are helpfully captioned. Overall, the entries are a triumph of clarity, as is the cross-referencing, and all this combines to ensure easy consultation. There is no doubt that the Dictionary will soon become a 'must buy' for educational establishments where such a collection of myths will surely service and support Arts and Humanities departments, and even beyond.

Personal engagement with the myths is never far from the surface. The author's own translations of key passages within the entries contribute to this sense of involvement and individual voice. M. herself waxes lyrical in the Introduction about the numinous landscape of the ancient world for many of those who inhabited it. So, it is only hesitantly that I offer the criticism that occasionally the surface has had to be skimmed when it comes to the cultural texture of the myths from the modern perspective. I feel that more might have been said in the Introduction about the aesthetical complexities of myth-making and interpreting both in Classical times and in post-classical reception. Perhaps this would have led the book into territory forbidden by its wealth of information, and I fully appreciate the limitations placed upon the author in this respect. I have already indicated that the entries themselves are vivid and readable precisely because they are not over-intellectualized.

On the other hand, the sophistication of the ancient authors in implying and exploring nuances and layers of meaning has been enormously influential upon modern exploitations and re-creations of the myth. There might have been ways at the outset of the book of signposting this significance for the intellectually curious reader as well as celebrating the lasting legacy and attraction of the myths as stories. M.'s own work in the field of interpretation has demonstrated her capability for the task, so this must have been a conscious drawing in of horns.

In conclusion, M.'s *Dictionary of Classical Mythology* admirably fulfils a very challenging brief. Cassell are to be congratulated in identifying the gap in the market and making such a happy choice of author to compile and communicate so many myths with unfailing accuracy and unflagging devotion.

The Open University PAULA JAMES